THE CASE OF Resistance OF THE SUPREME POWERS Stated and Resolved,

According to the

DOCTRINE OF THE Holy SCRIPTURES.

By *WILL. SHERLOCK*, DD.
Master of the TEMPLE.

The Second Edition.

LONDON: Printed for T. Basset, and W. Crooke, and are to be Sold by *Randal Taylor*, near *Stationers-Hall*. 1690.

Ded 1684

LIBRARY OF THE
UNION
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY
NEW YORK

To the Right Honourable

FRANCIS

Lord GUILFORD,

Lord KEEPER of the Great Seal of *England*, and One of His Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

My Lord,

I *Humbly beg leave to present to your Lordship's Hands, a very plain Discourse, but very necessary in such an Age as this, wherein the Principles of Rebellion are openly profest and taught, and the Doctrine of Non resistance and Passive-Obedience, not confuted, but laught out of countenance.*

There have been indeed a great many excellent Books writ upon this Argument by learned men; but I fear most of them are too learned for ordinary Readers, who most need instruction, and are most easily poisoned with Seditious Doctrines; and therefore there is still occasion enough for such a small Treatise as this, which I hope is fitted to the understanding of the meanest Men, who will be so honest, as impartially to con-

ſider it: and thoſe who will not read nor conſider, what is offered for their conviction, are out of the reach of all inſtruction, and muſt be governed by other methods.

My Lord,

Your Lordſhips known Loyalty and Zeal for the Service of the Crown, which by the favour of a wiſe and diſcerning Prince has deſervedly advanced you to ſo high a Station, made me preſume, that ſuch a Preſent as this, though in itſelf very mean, might not be unacceptable to you, eſpecially when it is intended as a Publick Acknowledgment (the beſt which my mean Circumſtances in the World enable me to make) of thoſe great Favours I have received from your Lordſhip.

That God would bleſs your Lordſhip with a long Life, and vigorous Age, and encreaſe of Honour, for the Service of the King, and of the Church, is the Prayer of,

My Lord,

Your Lordſhip's moſt humble
and moſt obedient Servant,

W. SHERLOCK.

THE CASE OF Resistance OF THE SUPREME POWERS

Stated and Resolved,

According to the Doctrine of the Holy SCRIPTURES.

The INTRODUCTION.

I Presume, I need make no Apology for the seasonableness of this Discourse at this time; for if ever it be fit to put People in mind of that Subjection which they owe to the Higher Powers, no time can be more proper for it, than when we see the Peace and Security of

Publick Government disturbed and endangered by *Popish* and *Fanatick Conspiracies*, who like *Sampson's Foxes*, though they look very different ways, yet are tyed together by the *Tail* with a *Firebrand* between them; and had not the good Providence of God wonderfully appeared for the preservation of his *Anointed*, I am sure it had been a very unseasonable time now to have Treated on this Subject: and therefore, letting aside all *Apologies*, I shall only give a brief account of the Design of this following *Treatise*.

There are three ways of proving and confirming the *Doctrine* of *Non-resistance*, or *Subjection* to *Soveraign Princes*. 1. By the *Testimonies* of the *Holy Scriptures*. 2. By the Doctrine and Practice of the Primitive Christians. 3. By the Fundamental Constitutions of that particular Government under which we live. I have considered the last, as much as was necessary to my purpose. The second I have not medled with: for whoever has a mind to be satisfied about it, may consult that admirable Discourse of *Archbishop Usher*, about the Power of the *Prince*, and the Obedience of the *Subject*; which will not cost much money, nor take

take up much time to read it. But the design I proposed to myself, was carefully to consider the Testimonies of Scripture, which are beyond all other Authorities, and to vindicate them from the Cavils and Exceptions of the several Patrons of *Resistance*. And the whole Discourse is divided into these following Chapters,

1. The First contains the Authorities of the *Old Testament*; wherein I have plainly shewn, that *God* himself set up a Soveraign and Irresistible Power in the *Jewish Nation*; and that during all that time, it was unlawful for *Subjects*, upon any pretence whatsoever, to resist *their Princes*.

2. The Second contains the Doctrine of our *Saviour*, concerning Subjection to *Soveraign Princes*.

3. The Third contains an account of our *Saviour*'s Example in this matter.

4. The Fourth considers what Saint *Paul*'s Doctrine was about Subjection.

5. The Fifth, the Doctrine of Saint *Peter*.

6. The Sixth contains an Answer to the most popular Objections against *Non-Resistance*.

In examining the Authorities of *Scri-*

pture, I have carefully considered whatever has been plausibly urged in defence of the *Doctrine* of *Resistance*, and reduced it under those particular *Texts* which have been thought most to favour it: and I do not know of any thing material, which has been pleaded in this Cause, which I have wholly omitted. Possibly some may complain, that I have not observed the exact *Rules* of *Art* and *Method* in this, to propose the *Question*, to explain the *Terms* of it, to produce my *Proofs*, and then to answer the *Objections* which are made against it. Now this I must acknowledge in part to be true; and I think this *Discourse* never the less perfect for that. The Proposition I undertake to prove, is this: That *Soveraign Princes*, or the *Supreme Power* in any Nation, in whomsoever it is plac'd, is in all cases irresistible. This is a plain Proposition, which needs no explanation: and the way I take to prove it, is as plain; by producing the *Testimonies* of *Scripture* both of the *Old* and *New Testament*, as they lie in order, and shewing what *Power* they grant to *Princes*, and what *Obedience* they require of *Subjects*. This is the fairest way I could think on, to give my *Readers* a full view

of

of the *Doctrine* of the *Scriptures* in this matter; and this was all I intended to do: for I am verily perswaded, that were men once convinced that *Resistance* of *Princes* is expresly contrary to the *Doctrine* both of the *Old* and *New Testament*, it would be no easie matter, by any other Arts or Pretences, to draw the most fanatical and factious persons amongst us (who retain any Reverence for God) into a Rebellion.

THE

CHAP.

CHAP. I.

Wherein the Unlawfulness of Resisting the Supreme Power is proved, from the Authority of the Old Testament.

TO prove the unlawfulness of *Resistance*, I shall begin with the Old Testament. Now there is nothing more evident, than that God set up such a Supreme and Soveraign Power in the *Jewish Nation*, as could not, and ought not to be resisted by the Fundamental Laws of their Government. For this is all I am concerned at present to prove, That it is never lawful to resist the *Higher Powers*; not that the Supreme and Soveraign Power is always to be *in a single Person*, but that where-ever it is, it is irresistible, and that whenever this Supreme Power by the *Laws* of the *Nation*, is invested in a *single Person*, such a Prince must not upon any pretence whatsoever be resisted.

The first Governour God set over the Chil-

Children of *Israel*, when he brought them out of the Land of *Ægypt*, was *Moſes*; and I think I need not prove how Sacred and irreſiſtible his Authority was. This is ſufficiently evident in the Rebellion of *Korah*, *Dathan*, and *Abiram*, againſt *Moſes* and *Aaron*, when God cauſed the earth to open her mouth and ſwallow them up, 16 *Numbers*. And leſt this ſhould be thought an extraordinary caſe, *Moſes* and *Aaron* being extraordinary perſons, immediately appointed by God, and governed by his immediate direction; the Apoſtle St *Jude* alledges this Example againſt thoſe in his days, who were turbulent and factious, *who deſpiſed dominions, and ſpake evil of dignities, that they ſhould periſh in the gainſaying of Core*, Jud. v. 11. which he could not have done, had not this example extended to all ordinary, as well as extraordinary Caſes; had it not been a laſting teſtimony of God's diſpleaſure againſt all thoſe, who oppoſe themſelves againſt the *Soveraign Powers*. But *Moſes* was not always to rule over them, and therefore God expreſly provides for a Succeſſion of *Soveraign Power*, to which they muſt all ſubmit. The *ordinary Soveraign* Power of the *Jewiſh* Na-

Nation after *Moses* his death, was devolved either on the *High Priest*, or those extraordinary persons whom God was pleased to raise up, such as *Joshua* and the several *Judges*, till in *Samuel's* days it setled in their *Kings*. For as for the *Jewish Sanhedrim*, whose Power is so much extolled by the *Jewish Writers*, who are all of a late date, many years since the destruction of *Jerusalem*, and therefore no competent *witnesses* of what was done so many Ages before, it does not appear from any testimony of Scripture, that there was any such *Court* of *Judicature*, till after their return from the *Babylonish Captivity*.

But yet God took care to secure the Peace and good Government of the Nation, by appointing such a Power as should receive the last *Appeals*, and whose *Sentence* in all *Controversies* should be final, and uncontroulable, as you may see in the 17 *Deut.* 8,9,10,11, 12 *v.* There were inferiour Magistrates and *Judges* appointed in their several Tribes and Cities, which *Moses* did by the advice of *Jethro* his Father-in-law, and by the approbation of God, *Exod.* 18. But as the Supreme Power was still reserved in the hands of *Moses*, while

he

he lived, ſo it is here ſecured to the *High Prieſt*, or *Judges*, after his death; for it is exreſly appointed, that if thoſe inferiour *Judges* could not determine the Controverſie, they ſhould come unto the *Prieſts*, the *Levites*; that is, the Prieſts of the *Tribe* of *Levi*, (who by the 12 *ver.* appears only to be the *High Prieſt*) *and to the Judge that ſhall be in thoſe days*; that is, if it ſhall be at ſuch a time, when there is an extraordinary Judge raiſed by God, (for there were not always ſuch *Judges* in *Iſrael*, as is evident to any one who reads the Book of *Judges*) and of them they ſhould *inquire, and they ſhall ſhew the ſentence of Judgment*; and *thou ſhalt do according to the Sentence which they of that place, (which the Lord ſhall chooſe) ſhall ſhew thee, and thou ſhalt obſerve to do according to all they ſhall inform thee.* Where the Place which God ſhall chooſe, ſignifies the Place which he ſhould appoint for the *Ark* of the *Covenant*, and for the *Levitical Worſhip*; which was the place where the *High Prieſt*, and the *chief Judge* or Ruler of *Iſrael*, when there was any ſuch perſon, had their ordinary reſidence; which was at firſt at *Shilo*, and afterwards at *Jeruſalem*.

And

And what the Authority of the *chief Priest*, or of the *Judge* when there was one, was in those days, appears from *v.* 12. *And the man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken to the Priest, (that standeth to minister there before the Lord thy God) or unto the Judge, even that man shall die, and thou shalt put away the evil from Israel.* This is as absolute Authority, as the most absolute *Monarch* in the World can challenge, that disobedience to their last and final determination, whatever the cause be, shall be punisht with death: and what place can there be for *Resistance* in such a Constitution of Government as this? It is said indeed in *v.* 11. according *to the sentence of the Law, which they shall teach thee, and according to the judgment that they shall tell thee, thou shalt do.* And hence some conclude, that they were not bound to abide by their Sentence, nor were punishable, if they did not, but only in such cases, when they gave Sentence according to the Law of God. But these Men do not consider that the matter in controversie is supposed to be doubtful, and such as could not be determined by the *inferiour Courts*, and therefore is submitted

ted to the decision of the *Supreme Judge*; and as he determined, so they must do; and no man, under the penalty of death, must presume to do otherwise: which takes away all liberty of judging from private persons, though this *Supreme Judge* might possibly mistake in his Judgment, as all *humane Judicatures* are liable to mistakes; but it seems God Almighty thought it necessary that there should be some final Judgment, from whence there should be no *appeal*, notwithstanding the possibility of a mistake in it.

So that there was a *Supreme* and *Soveraign*, that is, unaccountable and irresistible Power in the *Jewish Nation* appointed by God himself: for indeed it is not possible that the publick Peace and Security of any Nation should be preserved without it. And I think it is as plain, that when the *Jews* would have a *King*, their *Kings* were invested with this *Supreme* and *Irresistible Power*; for when they desired a *King*, they did not desire a meer *nominal* and *titular King*, but a *King to judge them*, and *to go out before them, and fight their battels*; that is, a *King* who had the Supreme and Soveraign Authority, 1 *Sam.* 8. 6. 19. 20.

a *King* who should have all that Power of Government, excepting the peculiar Acts of the Priestly Office, which either their *High-Priest* or their *Judges* had before.

And therefore when *Samuel* tells them what shall be the *manner* of their *King*, 11 *ver.* though what he says does necessarily suppose the translation of the Soveraign and Irresistible Power to the Person of their *King*, yet it does not suppose that the *King* had any new Power given him more than what was exercised formerly by their *Priests* and *Judges*. He does not deter them from chusing a *King*, because a *King* should have greater Power, and be more uncontroulable and irresistible than their other *Rulers* were: for *Samuel* himself had had as soveraign and irresistible a Power as any King, being the Supreme Judge in *Israel*, whose Sentence no man could disobey or contradict, but he incurred the penalty of death, according to the Mosaical Law. But the reason why he dissuades them from chusing a *King*, was because the external *Pomp* and *Magnificence* of *Kings* was like to be very chargeable and oppressive to them. *He will take your sons and appoint them for himself,*

himself, for his chariots, and to be his horsemen, and some shall run before his chariots. And he will appoint him captains over thousands, and captains over fifties, and will set them to ear his ground, and to reap his harvest. And thus in several particulars he acquaints them what burdens and exactions they will bring upon themselves by setting up a *King*, which they were then free from: And if any *Prince* should be excessive in such exactions, yet they had no way to help themselves: they must not resist nor rebel against him, nor expect, that what inconvenience they might find in *Kingly Government*, God would relieve and deliver them from it, when once they had chose a *King*: *Ye shall cry out in that day, because of your King which ye have chosen you, and the Lord will not hear you in that day*, v. 18. That is, God will not alter the *Government* for you again, how much soever you may complain of it.

This, I say, is a plain proof that their *Kings* were invested with that Soveraign Power which must not be resisted, though they oppress their Subjects to maintain their own State, and the Grandeur and Magnificence of their King-

dom. But I cannot think, that these words contain the *Original Grant* and Charter of Regal Power, but only the translation of that Power which was formerly in their *High-Priests* or *Judges to Kings*. *Kings* had no more Power than their other Governours had: for there can be no Power greater than that which is irresistible; but this Power in the hands of *Kings* was likely to be more burdensome and oppressive to them, than it was in the hands of their *Priests* and *Judges*, by reason of their different way of living; which is the onely argument *Samuel* uses to dissuade them from transferring the *Supreme* and *Soveraign Power* to *Princes*. And therefore I rather choose to Translate *Mishpat*, as our Translators do, *by the manner of the King*, than as other learned Men do, *by the right of the King*, thereby understanding the Original Charter of Kingly Power: for it is not the Regal Power which *Samuel* here blames, which is no other but the very same Power which he himself had, while he was Supreme *Judge* of *Israel*, but their pompous way of living, which would prove very oppressive and burdensome to them, and be apt to make them complain, who had not been used to such exactions. And

And here before I proceed, give me leave to make a ſhort digreſſion in vindication of *Kingly Government*, which ſome men think is greatly diſparaged by this ſtory. For 1. It is evident that God was angry with the *Jews* for deſiring a *King*; and declared his anger againſt them, by ſending a violent Tempeſt of Thunder and Rain in Wheat-harveſt; which made them confeſs, *that they had added to all their ſins this evil, to ask a King*, 1 *Sam.* 12. 16, 17, *&c.* From whence ſome conclude, that Kingly Power and Authority is ſo far from being the Original appointment and conſtitution of God, that it is diſpleaſing to him. And 2. That *Samuel* in deſcribing *the manner of the King*, repreſents it as oppreſſive and uneaſie to Subjects, and much more burdenſome, and leſs deſirable than other Forms of Government.

1. As for the firſt, it muſt be acknowledged, that God was angry with the *Children of Iſrael* for asking a *King*: but then theſe men miſtake the reaſon, which was not becauſe God is an enemy to *Kingly Government*, but becauſe he himſelf was the *King of Iſrael*; and by asking a *King* to go in and out before them, they expreſt a diſlike of *God's Govern-*

ment of them. Thus God tells *Samuel*, *They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them*, 1 *Sam.* 8. 7. And thus *Samuel* aggravates their sin, *that they said, Nay, but a King shall reign over us; when the Lord your God was your King*, 12 *Chap.* 12 *v.*

Now the Crime had been the same, had they set up an *Aristocratical* or *Democratical* Government, as well as *Regal* Power, in derogation of God's Government of them. Their fault was not in choosing to be governed by a single Person; for so they had been governed all along, by *Moses* and *Joshua*, by their *High Priests*, or those other extraordinary *Judges* whom God had raised up, and at this very time by *Samuel* himself; for it is a great mistake to think that the *Jews*, before they chose a *King*, were governed by a *Synedrial Power*, like an *Aristocracy* or *Democracy*, which there is not the least appearance of in all the *Sacred History*; for as for those persons whom *Moses* by the advice of *Jethro* set over the People, they were not a Supreme or *Soveraign Tribunal*, but such *Subordinate Magistrates* as every *Prince* makes use of for administring Justice to the

the People. *They were Rulers of thousands, Rulers of hundreds, Rulers of fifties, Rulers of tens*, 18 *Exod.* 21. and were ſo far from being one ſtanding Judicature, that they were divided among their ſeveral Tribes and Families: and were ſo far from being Supreme, that *Moſes* ſtill reſerved all difficult caſes, and laſt appeals, that is, the true Soveraign Power to himſelf, as it was afterwards by an expreſs Law reſerved to the *High Prieſts*, and *Judges* extraordinarily appointed: and there is ſo little appearance of this Soveraign Tribunal in *Samuel*'s days, that he himſelf went in Circuit every Year, as our Judges now do, to *Bethel* and *Gilgal*, and *Mizpeh*, and *judged Iſrael*, 1 Sam. 7. 16.

But the fault of *Iſrael* in asking a *King* was this, that they preferred the Government of a King, before the immediate Government of God. For the underſtanding of which, it will be neceſſary to conſider briefly, how God's Government of *Iſrael* differ'd from their Government by *Kings*. For when they had choſe a *King*, did God ceaſe to be the King of *Iſrael*? was not their King God's Miniſter and Vicegerent, as their Rulers and Judges were before? was

not the King God's Anointed? and did he not receive the Laws and Rules of Government from him? yes, this is in some measure true, and yet the difference is very great.

While God was the King of *Israel* though he appointed a Supreme visible Authority in the Nation, yet the exercise of this Authority was under the immediate direction and government of God. *Moses* and *Joshua* did not stir a step, nor attempt any thing without God's order, no more than a menial servant does without the direction of his Master. In times of Peace, they were under the ordinary government of the *High Priest*, who was God's immediate servant, who declared the Law to them, and in difficult cases, referred the cause to God, who gave forth his Answers by him: when they were oppress't by their enemies, which God never permitted, but for their sins, when they repented and begged God's pardon and deliverance, God raised up some *extraordinary Persons* endued with an extraordinary spirit, to fight their Battels for them, and subdue their Enemies, and to judge *Israel*; and these Men did every thing by a Divine impulse and inspiration, as *Moses* and

and *Joshua* did. So that they were as immediately governed by God, as any Man governs his own House and Family. But when the Government was put into the hands of *Kings*, God in a great measure left the administration of it to the will and pleasure of *Princes*, and to the methods of humane Governments and Policy.

Though God did immediately appoint *Saul*, and afterwards *David* to be King, yet ordinarily the government descended not by God's immediate choice, but by the *Right* of *Succession*: and though some Kings were Prophets too, yet it was not often so; they were not so immediately directed by God as the *Judges* of old were, but had their Councels of State for Advice in Peace and War, and their standing Armies and Guards for the defence of their Persons and Government. They were indeed commanded to govern by the Laws of *Moses*, to consult the Oracles of God in difficult cases, and God raised up extraordinary Prophets to direct them, but still it was in their own power, whether they would obey the Laws of God, or hearken to his Prophets; good Kings did, and bad Kings did not; and there-

fore the Government of *Israel* by Kings, was like other humane Governments, liable to all the defects and miscarriages which other Governments are; whereas while the government was immediately in God's hands, they did not only receive their *Laws*, and external *Polity* from him, but the very executive Power was in God: for though it was administred by Men, yet it was administred by God's immediate direction, with the most exact Wisdom, Justice and Goodness.

This was the sin of the *Jews*, that they preferred the Government of an earthly King, before having God for their King; and this must be acknowledged to be a great fault, but it is such a fault, as no other Nation was ever capable of, but only the *Jews*, because God never vouchsafed to be *King* of any other Nation in such a manner; and therefore we must not compare Kingly Government, for there is no competition between them, with the Government of God, but we must compare Kingly Government with any other form of humane Government; and then we have reason to believe, that notwithstanding God was angry with the *Jews*, and this was a case peculiar to the *Jews* for defi-

ring

ring a *King*, that yet he prefers Kingly Government before any other, becauſe when he foreſaw that the *Jews* would in time grow weary of his Government, he makes proviſion in their Law, for ſetting up a King, not for ſetting up an *Ariſtocratical* or *Democratical* Power, which their Law makes no allowance for, as you may ſee, 17 *Deut.* 14.

2. Another Objection againſt Kingly Power and Government, is, that *Samuel* in this place repreſents it as very oppreſſive and burdenſome to the Subject, For what ſome Men anſwer, that *Samuel* ſpeaks here only of the abuſe of *Regal* Power, I think is not true; for the meer abuſe of Power is no Argument againſt it, becauſe all kind and forms of Power are liable to be abuſed, and by this reaſon we ſhould have no Government at all. And it is evident, that *Samuel* does not mention any one thing here, that can be called an Abuſe of Power, nothing but what is abſolutely neceſſary to maintain the State and Magnificence of an *Imperial Crown*. For how can a Prince ſubſiſt without Officers and Servants of all ſorts, both Men and Women, both for the uſes of his Family, and the ſervice of his Government both

in

in Peace and War? and how can this be maintained, but by a Revenue proportionable to the Expence? and since none of them had such an Estate, as to defray this Charge themselves, whoever was to be chosen King, must have it from others, by publick Grants and publick Taxes, which he here expresses by *taking their fields and their vineyards, and their olive-yards, the tenth of their fields, and their vineyards, and the tenth of their sheep, for himself and his servants*, the Tenth being the usual Tribute paid to the *Eastern Kings*. This is not an abuse of Power, though some *Princes* might be excessive in all this, but it is *the manner of the King*, that which is necessary to his Royal State. There is nothing of all this forbid in 17 *Deuter.* where God gives Laws to the *King*; and indeed to forbid this, would be to forbid Kingly Power, which cannot subsist without it.

Indeed I find some Learned Men mistaken in this matter; for they take it for granted, that what *Samuel* here calls *the manner of the King*, is such an abuse of Power, as God had expresly forbid to Kings in the 17 of *Deuter.* 16, 17. but why the abuse of Regal Power should be

be called *the manner* or *the right* of the King, is past my understanding. *Mishpat*, however you translate it, must signifie something which is essential to Kingly Government, otherwise *Samuel's* Argument against chusing a *King* had been sophistical and fallacious. For there is no Form of Government but is liable to great abuses, when it falls into ill hands: and this they had experience of at this very time; for the miscarriages of *Samuel's Sons*, was the great reason, why the People at this time desired a King, 1 *Sam.* 8. 3, 4, 5. And if we compare these two places together, what God forbids the King, with what *Samuel* calls *the manner of the King*, we shall find nothing alike. In the 17 of *Deut.* 16, 17. *v.* God tells them, That their King *shall not multiply horses to himself, nor cause the people to return into Egypt, to the end that he should multiply horses, for as much as the Lord hath said unto you, Ye shall henceforth return no more that way.* God would not allow them to have any Commerce or Intercourse with *Egypt*, and therefore forbid their *Kings* to multiply Horses, with which *Egypt* did abound, that there might be no new familiarity contracted with that Ido-

Idolatrous Nation. Neither shall he *multiply wives to himself, that his heart turn not away.* Where *multiplying wives* seems plainly to refer to his taking wives of other Nations and other Religions, as appears from what is added, *that his heart turn not away:* that is, lest they should seduce him to *Idolatry*, as we know *Solomon's* Wives did him, who are therefore said to *turn away his heart*, 1 Kings 11. 3, 4. *Neither shall he greatly multiply to himself silver and gold.* For such a covetous humour would mightily tempt him to oppress his Subjects. This is all that God expresly forbids their Kings, when they should have any. But now *Samuel* in describing *the manner of the King*, takes no notice of any thing of all this, but only tells them, that their *King* would appoint out fit Persons for his service of their Sons and Daughters, that they should pay *Tribute* to him, and should themselves be his *Servants*; not as Servants signifies Slaves and Vassals, but Subjects, who owe all Duty and Service to their Prince as far as he needs them.

But what is it then that *Samuel* finds fault with in *Kingly Power*, and which he uses as an argument to dissuade the Children

dren of *Israel* from desiring a King: why it is no more, than the necessary Expences and Services of *Kingly Power*, which would be thought very grievous to them, who were a Free People, and at that time subject to no Publick Services and Exactions. The Government they then lived under was no charge at all to them. They were governed, as I observed before, either by their *High Priest*, or by *Judges* extraordinarily raised by God. As for their *High Priests*, God himself had allotted their maintenance sutable to the quality and dignity of their Office; and therefore they were no more charge to the People when they were their Supreme Governours, than they were, when the Power was in other hands, either in the hands of *Judges* or *Kings*. As for their *Judges* whom God raised up, they affected nothing of Royal Greatness, they had no Servants or Retinue, standing Guards or Armies to maintain their Authority, which was secured by that Divine Power with which they acted, not by the external pomp and splendour of a Court. Thus we find *Moses* appealing to God in the Rebellion of *Korah*, *I have not taken one Ass from them, neither have I hurt any of them,*

them, 16 Numbers 15. And thus *Samuel* appeals to the Children of *Israel* themselves, *Behold, here I am, witness against me before the Lord, and before his Anointed; whose Oxe have I taken? or whose Ass have I taken? or whom have I defrauded? whom have I oppressed? or of whose hands have I received any bribe to blind mine eyes therewith? and I will restore it*, 1 Sam. 12. 3. Now a People, who lived so free from all Tributes, Exactions, and other Services due to Princes, must needs be thought sick of Ease and Liberty, to exchange so cheap, so free a State, for the necessary Burdens and Expences of Royal Power, though it were no more than what is necessary: which is the whole of *Samuel's* argument, not that Kingly Government is more expensive and burdensome than any other form of human Government, but that it was to bring a new burden upon themselves, when they had none before. No humane Governments, whether *Democracies* or *Aristocracies*, can subsist, but upon the publick charge, and the necessary expences of *Kingly Power* are not greater than of a *Commonwealth*. I am sure this *Kingdom* did not find their Burdens eased by pulling down their *King*; and

I

I believe, whoever acquaints himself with the several Forms of Government, will find *Kingly Power* to be as easie upon this score, as Commonwealths. So that what *Samuel* discourses here, and which some Men think so great a reflection upon *Kingly Government*, does not at all concern us, but was peculiar to the state and condition of the *Jews* at that time.

Let us then proceed to consider how sacred and irresistible the Persons and Authority of Kings were under the *Jewish Government*; and there cannot be a plainer example of this, than in the case of *David*. He was himself anointed to be *King after Saul's* death, but in the mean time was grievously persecuted by *Saul*, pursued from one place to another, with a design to take away his life. How now does *David* behave himself in this extremity? What course does he take to secure himself from *Saul*? Why he takes the onely course that is left a Subject; he flies for it, and hides himself from *Saul* in the Mountains and Caves of the Wilderness; and when he found he was discovered in one place, he removes to another: He kept Spies upon *Saul* to observe his motions,

not

not that he might meet him to give him Battel, or to take him at an advantage; but that he might keep out of his way, and not fall unawares into his hands.

Well, but this was no thanks to *David*, because he could do no otherwise. He was too weak for *Saul*, and not able to stand against him; and therefore had no other remedy but flight. But yet we must consider, that *David* was a Man of War, he slew *Goliah*, and fought the Battels of *Israel* with great success; he was an admired and beloved Captain, which made *Saul* so jealous of him; the eyes of *Israel* were upon him for their next King, and how easily might he have raised a potent and formidable Rebellion against *Saul!* But he was so far from this, that he invites no man to his assistance; and when some came uninvited, he made no use of them in an offensive or defensive War against *Saul*. Nay, when God delivered *Saul* two several times into *David*'s hands, that he could as easily have killed him, as have *cut off the skirts of his garment at Engedi*, 1 Sam. 24. or as have taken that *spear away which stuck in the ground at his bolster, as he did in the hill of Hachilah*, 1 Sam. 26. yet he would neither touch

Saul

Saul himself, nor suffer any of the People that were with him to do it, though they were very importunate with him for liberty to kill *Saul*; nay, though they urged him with an argument from Providence, that it was a plain evidence that it was the Will of God that he should kill *Saul*, because God had now delivered his enemy into his hands, according to the promise he had made to *David*, 1 *Sam* 24. 4. 26 *ch. ver* 8. We know what use some men have made of this argument of Providence, to justifie all the *Villanies* they had a mind to act: but *David*, it seems, did not think that an opportunity of doing evil, gave him license and authority to do it. Opportunity, we say, makes a *Thief*, and it makes a *Rebel*, and it makes a *Murderer*: No man can do any Wickedness, which he has no opportunity of doing; and if the Providence of God, which puts such opportunities into mens hands, justifies the wickedness they commit, no man can be chargeable with any guilt whatever he does; and certainly opportunity will as soon justifie any other sin, as Rebellion, and the Murder of Princes. We are to learn our duty from the Law of God, not from his Provi-

dence; at least, this must be a setled Principle, that the Providence of God will never justifie any action which his Law forbids.

And therefore, notwithstanding this opportunity which God had put into his hands to destroy his enemy, and to take the Crown for his reward, *David* considers his duty, remembers that though *Saul* were his enemy, and that very unjustly, yet he was the *Lord's Anointed*. *The Lord forbid*, says he, *that I should do this unto my Master the Lord's Anointed, to stretch forth my hand against him, seeing he is the Lord's Anointed.* Nay, he was so far from taking away his life, that his heart smote him for cutting off the skirt of his Garment. And we ought to observe the reason *David* gives, why he durst not hurt *Saul*, Because he was *the Lord's Anointed*; which is the very reason the Apostle gives in the 13 *Rom.* 1, 2. *Because the powers are ordained of God; and he that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God.* For to be anointed of God, signifies no more than that he was made King by God. Thus *Josephus* expounds being *anointed* by God, ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ βασιλείας ἀξιωθείς, one who had the Kingdom bestowed on him

him by God; and ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κεχειροτονημένος, one who was ordained by God. For it seems by this phrase, he look'd upon the external ceremony of *Anointing* to be like imposition of hands, which in other cases consecrated Persons to peculiar offices. For this external Unction was only a visible sign of God's designation of them to such an Office; and when that was plain, they were as much *God's Anointed* without this visible Unction as with it. *Cyrus* is called God's Anointed, though he never was anointed by any Prophet, but onely designed for his Kingdom by Prophesie, 45 *Isai.* 1. And we never read in Scripture, that any *Kings* had this external Unction, who succeeded in the Kingdom by right of Inheritance, unless the Title and Succession were doubtful; and yet they were the Lord's Anointed too, that is, were plac'd in the Throne by him. So that this is an eternal reason against resisting Soveraign Princes, that they are set up by God, and invested with his Authority; and therefore their Persons and their Authority are sacred.

But yet there are some Men, who from the example of *David*, think they can prove the lawfulness of a defensive,

though not of an offensive War. For *David*, when he fled from *Saul*, made himself Captain of four hundred men, 1 *Sam.* 22. 2. which number soon increased to six hundred, 1 *Sam.* 23. 13. and still every day increased by new additions, 1 *Chron.* 12. 1. Now why should he entertain these men, but to defend himself against the Forces of *Saul*; that is, to make a defensive War whenever he was assaulted by him.

1. In answer to this, I observe, that *David* invited none of these men after him, but they came Voluntiers after a Beloved Captain and General; which shews how formidable he could easily have made himself, when such numbers resorted to him of their own accord.

2. When he had them, he never used them for any hostile acts against *Saul*, or any of his Forces; he never stood his ground, when he heard *Saul* was coming, but always fled, and his men with him; men who were never used to flie, and were very ready to have served him against *Saul* himself, would he have permitted them. And I suppose they will not call this a defensive War, to flie before an enemy, and to hide themselves in Caves and Mountains;

tains; and yet this was the onely defenſive War which *David* made with all his men about him: Nay, all that he would make, and all that he could make, according to his profeſſed Principles, that it *was not lawful to ſtretch out his hand againſt the Lord's Anointed.* And when theſe men are purſued, as *David* was, by an enraged and jealous Prince, we will not charge them with Rebellion, though they flie before him by thouſands in a Company.

3. Yet there was ſufficient reaſon why *David* ſhould entertain theſe men, who voluntarily reſorted to him, though he never intended to uſe them againſt *Saul*: for ſome of them ſerved for Spies to obſerve *Saul*'s motions, that he might not be ſurprized by him, but have timely notice to make his eſcape. And the very preſence of ſuch a number of men about him, without any hoſtile Act, preſerved him from being ſeized on by ſome officious Perſons, who otherwiſe might have delivered him into *Saul*'s hands. And he being anointed by *Samuel* to be *King* after *Saul*'s death, this was the firſt ſtep to his Kingdom, to have ſuch a retinue of valiant men about him; which made his advancement to the Throne

more easie, and discouraged any oppositions which might otherwise have been made against him; as we see it proved in the event, and have reason to believe that it was thus ordered by God for that very end. It is certain, that *Gad* the Prophet, and *Abiathar* the Priest, who was the only Man who escaped the fury of *Saul* when he destroyed the Priests of the Lord, were in *David's* Retinue; and that *David* enterprized nothing, without first asking counsel of God: But he who had anointed him to be *King*, now draws Forces after him, which after *Saul's* death should facilitate his advancement to the *Kingdom*.

2. It is objected further, that *David* intended to have stayed in *Keilah*, and to have fortified it against *Saul*, had not he been informed that the men of the City would have saved themselves by delivering him up to *Saul*, 1 Sam. 23. Now to maintain any strong Hold against a *Prince*, is an act of War, though it be but a defensive War. And I grant it is so, but deny that there is any appearance that *David* ever intended any such thing. *David* and his men, by God's appointment and direction, had

fought

fought with the *Philiſtins*, and ſmote them with a great ſlaughter, and ſaved *Keilah* from them; and as it is probable, did intend to have ſtaied ſome time in *Keilah*. But *David* had heard that *Saul* intended to come againſt *Keilah*, to deſtroy the City, and take him; and enquires of the *Lord* about it, and received an anſwer, that *Saul* would come againſt the City. He enquires again, whether the men of *Keilah* would deliver him up to *Saul*, and was anſwered, that they would. And upon this, he and his men leave *Keilah*, and betake themſelves to the ſtrong holds in the Wilderneſs.

But now is it likely, that if *David* had had any deſign to have fortified *Keilah* againſt *Saul*, he would have been afraid of the men of the City? He had 600 men with him in *Keilah*, a victorious Army, which had lately deſtroyed the *Philiſtines* who oppreſſed them; and therefore could eaſily have kept the Men of *Keilah* too in awe, if he had pleaſed, and have put it out of their power to deliver him to *Saul*. But all that *David* deſigned was, to have ſtaid there as long as he could, and, when *Saul* had drawn nigh, to have removed to ſome other

place: But when he understood the treacherous inclinations of the men of *Keilah*, and being resolved against all acts of hostility, he hastened his remove before *Saul* drew near. So that these men must find some other example than that of *David*, to countenance their rebellion against their *Prince*: for *David* never rebelled, never fought against *Saul*; but when he had a very potent Army with him, he and his men always fled, and hid themselves in the Wilderness, and places of difficult access.

The sum is this: God from the very beginning, set up such a supreme and soveraign power in the *Jewish Nation*, as could not, as ought not to be resisted. This power was at first in the hands of *Moses*; and when *Korah* and his company rebelled against him, God vindicated his Authority by a miraculous destruction of those Rebels: *for the earth opened her mouth and swallowed them up.* Afterward, when they came into *Canaan*, the ordinary exercise of this power was in their *High-Priests* and *Judges*, whom God raised up; whose Sentence and Judgment was final, and must not be resisted, under penalty of death; when the Children of *Israel* desired a

King,

King, this soveraign and irresistible power was transferred to him, and setled in his Person. *Saul* was the first King who was chosen by God, and anointed by *Samuel*; but for his Disobedience, was afterwards rejected by God, and *David* the Son of *Jesse*, was anointed *King* to succeed after *Saul*'s death: But in the mean time *David* was persecuted by *Saul*, who sought after his life. And though he himself was anointed by God, and *Saul* was rejected by him, yet he durst not resist nor oppose him, nor defend himself by force against the most unjust violence; but fled for his life, and hid himself in Caves and Mountains. Nay, when *Saul* was delivered into his hands by God, he durst not stretch out his hand against the Lord's Anointed.

But to proceed in the story: *Solomon*, *David*'s Son, who succeeded him in his Kingdom, did all those things which God had expresly forbid the King to do. He sent into *Egypt* for Horses, 1 *Kings* 10.28. He multiplied Wives, and *loved many strange women, (together with the daughter of Pharaoh) women of the Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Zidonians, and Hittites*, 1 Kings 11. 1. He multiplied Silver

Silver and Gold, 10 *chap.* 27. contrary to the command of God. For this God (who is the onely Judge of Soveraign Princes) was very angry with him, and threatens to rend the *Kingdom* from him; which was afterwards accomplished in the days of *Rhehoboam*: but yet this did not give authority to his Subjects to rebel. If to be under the direction and obligation of Laws, makes a limited Monarchy, it is certain the *Kingdom* of *Israel* was so. There were some things which the *King* was expresly forbid to do, as you have already heard; and the Law of *Moses* was to be the Rule of his Government, the standing Law of his Kingdom. And therefore he was commanded, when he came to the Throne, *to write a copy of the Law with his own hand, and to read in it all his days, that he might learn to fear the Lord his God, and to keep all the words of this Law, and these Statutes to do them*, 17 Deut. 18, 19, 20. and yet he was a Soveraign Prince: if he broke these Laws, God was his Judge and Avenger; but he was accountable to no earthly Tribunal.

Baasha killed *Nadab* the Son of *Jeroboam*, and reigned in his stead, 1 *Kings* 15.

15. 25,26,27. and for this and his other ſins, God threatens evil againſt *Baaſha*, and againſt his Houſe, 16 *Chron.* 7. *Zimri* ſlew *Elah* the Son of *Baaſha*, and ſlew all the Houſe of *Baaſha*; but he did not long enjoy the Kingdom, which he had uſurpt by Treaſon and Murder: for he reigned but ſeven days in *Tirzah*; which being beſieged and taken by *Omri*, he went into the Palace of the King's Houſe, and burnt the King's Houſe over him with fire, and died, *v.* 18.

This example *Jezebel* threatned *Jehu* with: *Had Zimri peace, who ſlew his maſter?* 2 Kings 9. 31. and yet *Nadab* and *Elah* were both of them very wicked Princes. And if that would juſtifie Treaſon and Murder, both *Baaſha* and *Zimri* had been very innocent.

This is a ſufficient evidence, how ſacred and inviolable the Perſons and Authority of the *Jewiſh Kings* were, during the time of that Monarchy. But it will not be amiſs, briefly to conſider what Obligations the *Jews* were under to be ſubject to the Higher Powers, when they were carried captive into *Babylon*. Now the Prophet *Jeremiah* had given an expreſs command to them, *Seek the peace of the city whither I have*

cauſed

caused you to be carried away captives, and pray to the Lord for it: for in the peace thereof ye shall have peace, 29 Jer. 7. Which made it a necessary duty to be subject to those powers, under whose government they lived. And accordingly we find, that *Mordecai* discovered the Treason *of Bigthana and Teresh, two of the King's Chamberlains, the Keepers of the door, who sought to lay hand on the King Ahasuerus*, 6 Esther 2. And how numerous and powerful the *Jews* were at this time, and what great disturbance they could have given to the *Empire*, appears evidently from the Book of *Esther*, *King Ahasuerus*, upon the suggestions of *Haman*, had granted a Decree for the destruction of the whole People of the *Jews*; which was sent into all the Provinces, written and sealed with the King's Ring. This Decree could never be reversed again; for that was contrary to the Laws of the *Medes* and *Persians*. And therefore when *Esther* had found favour with the *King*, all that could be done for the *Jews*, was to grant another Decree for them to defend themselves; which accordingly was done, and the effect of it was this: *That the Jews at Shusan slew three hundred*

dred

dred men, and the Jews of the other Provinces ſlew ſeventy and five thouſand, and reſted from their enemies, 9 Eſther 15, 16, 17. Without this Decree, *Mordecai* did not think it lawful to reſiſt, (which yet was a caſe of as great extremity and barbarous cruelty, as could ever happen) which made him put *Eſther* upon ſo hazardous an attempt, as to venture into the King's preſence, without being called; which was death by their Law, unleſs the King ſhould graciouſly hold out the golden Scepter to them, 4 *Eſth.* 11. and yet when they had obtained this Decree, they were able to defend themſelves, and to deſtroy their enemies; which is as famous an example of *Paſſive-Obedience*, as can be met with in any *Hiſtory*. And therefore the Prophet *Daniel* acknowledges to *Belteſhazzar*, *The moſt high God gave Nebuchadnezzar thy Father a Kingdom, and Majeſty, and Glory, and Honour: and for the Majeſty that he gave him, all people, nations, and languages trembled and feared before him. Whom he would he ſlew, and whom he would he kept alive; and whom he would he ſet up, and whom he would he pulled down*, 5 Dan. 18, 19. And if theſe Heathen Kings receive their power from God,

God, as the Prophet here affirms, St. *Paul* has made the application of it, *That he that resisteth, resisteth the ordinance of God.*

This may serve for the times of the Old Testament; and I shall conclude these testimonies with the saying of the wise man, who was both a Prophet and a King: *I counsel thee to keep the King's commandment, and that in regard of the oath of God: Be not hasty to go out of his sight, stand not in an evil thing; for he doth whatsoever pleaseth him. Where the word of a King is, there is power; and who may say unto him, What dost thou?* 8 Eccl. 2, 3, 4.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

The Doctrine of Christ concerning Non-Resistance.

LET us now consider, what Christ and his Apostles taught and practised about Obedience to *Soveraign Princes*; whereby we may learn, how far Christians are obliged by these Laws of *Subjection* and *Non-Resistance*.

1. I shall distinctly consider the Doctrine of Christ while he lived on Earth: and here are several things very fit to be observed.

1. We have no reason to suspect, that Christ would alter the Rights of Soveraign Power, and the Measures of Obedience and Subjection, which were fixt and determined by God himself. This was no part of his Commission, to change the external Forms and Polities of Civil Governments, which is an act of Secular Power and Authority, and does not belong to a *Spiritual Prince*. He who would not undertake to decide a petty

petty controversie, or to divide an Inheritance between two contending Brethren, 12 *Luke* 13, 14. can we think that he would attempt any thing of that vast consequence, as the changes and alterations of Civil Power, which would have unsetled the Fundamental Constitutions of all the Governments of the World at that time?

Our Saviour tells us, that *he came not to destroy the Law and the Prophets, but to fulfil it*, πληρῶσαι, to fill it up, to compleat and perfect it, 5 *Mat.* 17. that is, to fulfil the ancient Types and Prophesies in his own Person, to perfect an external and ceremonial, by a real and Evangelical righteousness, to perfect the Moral Laws with new instances and degrees of Vertue; but he abrogated no Moral Law, and therefore not the Laws of Obedience and Subjection to *Princes*, which has always been reduced to the fifth Commandment. Nay, he abrogated no Laws, but by perfecting and fulfilling them; and therefore he could make no alteration in the *Doctrine* of *Non-Resistance*, which is as perfect subjection as can or ought to be paid to Soveraign Princes. His *Kingdom was not of this world*, as he told *Pilate:* though he

was

was a King, he neither was an Enemy nor Rival to *Cæsar*; but had he abſolved his Diſciples from their Obedience to *Princes*, had he made it in any caſe lawful to Reſiſt (which was ſo expreſly forbid the *Jews* by God himſelf, and which is ſuch a Contradiction to the very Notion of Soveraign Power) he had been ſomewhat worſe than a Rival to all the *Princes* of the Earth; for though he had ſet up no Kingdom of his own, yet he had pulled down theirs. Whereas he took great care, that his Religion ſhould give no diſturbance to the World, nor create any reaſonable Jealouſies and Suſpicions to *Princes*, who had been very excuſable for their averſion to Chriſtianity, had it invaded the *Rights* and *Royalties* of their *Crowns*.

This makes it very improbable that our *Saviour* ſhould make any Alterations in Civil Powers, or Abridge the *Rights* of *Soveraignty*; which is ſo foreign to his deſign of coming into the World, and ſo incongruous to the Perſon which he ſuſtained: and yet he could not alter the Duties of Subjects, but he muſt alter the *Rights* of *Princes* too; he muſt take away the Soveraign Power of *Princes*, at the ſame time that

he makes it lawful for Subjects in any case whatsoever to resist. We may safely then conclude, That our Saviour has left the Government of the World as he found it: he has indeed given such admirable Laws, as will teach *Princes* to govern, and Subjects to obey better; which is the most effectual way to secure the publick Peace and Happiness, to prevent the Oppression of Subjects, and Rebellions against *Princes*: but he has not interposed in new modelling the Governments of the World, which is not of such Consequence, as some Men imagine. It is not the external form of Government, but the Fatherly Care and Prudence and Justice of *Governours*, and the dutiful Obedience of Subjects, which can make any People happy. If Princes and Subjects be good Christians, they may be happy under most forms of Government; if they be not, they can be happy under none. Had our Saviour given Subjects Liberty to Resist, to Depose, to Murder *Tyrannical Princes*, he had done them no kindness at all; for to give Liberty to Subjects to Resist, is only to Proclaim an Universal Licence to Factions and Seditions, and Civil Wars; and if any Man can think this

such

ſuch a mighty Bleſſing to the World, yet methinks it is not a Bleſſing proper for the *Prince of Peace* to give. But he who inſtructs *Princes* to rule as God's Miniſters and Vicegerents, and to expreſs a Fatherly Care and Concernment for the Happineſs of their Subjects, and that teaches Subjects to Reverence and Obey their *Prince*, as the Image of God, and quietly to ſubmit and yield to his Authority, and that Inforces theſe Laws both on Princes and Subjects in the Name and Authority of God, and from the conſideration of the future judgment, when Princes who abuſe their Power ſhall give an Account of it to their great Maſter, when Subjects, who reſiſt, ſhall receive to themſelves Damnation; and thoſe, who patiently and quietly ſuffer for God's ſake, ſhall have their Injuries redreſt, and their Obedience rewarded: I ſay, ſuch a Perſon as this, takes a more effectual courſe to reform the Abuſes of Civil Power, and to preſerve good Government in the World, then all our *wiſe Politicians* and *State-menders*, who think to reform the Government of the World by ſome State-Spells and Charms, without reforming thoſe who Govern, and thoſe who are

Governed. This our Saviour has done, and this is the best thing that could be done, nay this was all that he could do in this matter. He never usurpt any Civil Power and Authority, and therefore could not new Model the Governments of the World: he never offers any External Force and Compulsion to make Men obey his Laws, and therefore neither forces Princes to Rule well, nor Subjects to Obey; but he has taken the same Care of the Government of the World, as he has done of all the other Duties of Piety and Vertue; that is, he has given very good Laws, and threatned those who break them with Eternal Punishments: and as the Laws and Religion of our Saviour prevail, so will the Governments of the World mend, without altering the Model and Constitution of them.

2. But yet we have some positive Evidence, what our Saviour taught about Obedience to the higher Powers. I shall give you two Instances of it, which are as plain and expres as can be desired.

1. The first is that Answer our *Saviour* gave to the *Pharisees* and *Herodians*, when they consulted together to intangle

tangle him in his talk, 22 *Matth.* 15. &c. They come to him with great Ceremony and Addreſs, as to an infallible Oracle, to conſult him in a very weighty Caſe of Conſcience. They expreſs a great eſteem and aſſurance of his Sincerity, and Faithfulneſs, and Courage, as well as of his unerring Judgment, in declaring the Will of God to them. *Maſter, we know that thou art true, and teacheſt the way of God in Truth, neither careſt thou for any man, for thou regardeſt not the Perſon of Man*; that is, thou wilt not conceal nor pervert the Truth for fear nor favour: and then they propoſe an inſnaring Queſtion to him. *Tell us therefore, what thinkeſt thou? is it lawful to give Tribute to* Cæſar, *or not?* They thought it impoſſible that he ſhould give any Anſwer to this, which would not make him obnoxious, either to the *Roman Governours*, if he denied that the *Jews* might lawfully pay Tribute to *Cæſar*, or to the Phariſees and People, if he affirmed that they might: for there was a very potent Faction among them, who thought it unlawful for the *Jews* to own the Authority or Uſurpations of any *Foreign Prince*, or to pay Tribute to him, as to their *King*. They being

expressly forbid by their Law, *to set a Stranger over them for their King, who is not their Brother*, (*i. e.*) who is not a Natural *Jew*, 17 *Deut.* 15. and it seems they could not distinguish between their own voluntary Act in choosing a Stranger for their King, [which was indeed forbid by their Law] and their submitting to a *Foreign Prince*, when they were Conquered by him. Our Saviour, who knew their wicked Intention in all this, that they did not come with an honest design to be instructed in their Duty, but to seek an Advantage against him, expresses some Indignation at it; *Why tempt ye me, ye Hypocrites?* but yet to return them an Answer to that their Question, he bids them shew him the *Tribute-money*, that is, the Money in which they used to pay Tribute, and inquires whose Image and Superscription it had. For Coining of Money was as certain a Mark of Soveraignty, as making Laws, or the power of the Sword. Well, they acknowledge that the Image and Superscription on the Tribute-money was *Cæsars*; upon which he replies, *Render therefore unto* Cæsar *the things that are* Cæsars, *and unto God the things that are God's*. The plain meaning of which

Answer

Anſwer is this, That ſince by the very Impreſſion on their Money, it is evident, that *Cæſar* is their *Soveraign Lord*, they muſt render to him all the *Rights* of *Soveraignty*, among which *Tribute* is one, as St. *Paul* tells us, *Render therefore unto all their dues, Tribute to whom Tribute is due, Cuſtom to whom Cuſtom, fear to whom fear, honour to whom honour*, 13 *Rom.* 7. Whatever is due to *Soveraign Princes*, and does not interfere with their duty to God, that they muſt give to *Cæſar*, who at this time was their *Soveraign*. In which Anſwer there are ſeveral things obſervable.

1. That our Saviour does not examine into *Cæſar*'s Right, nor how he came by this Soveraign Power; but as he found him in poſſeſſion of it, ſo he leaves him, and requires them to render to him all the *Rights* of *Soveraignty*.

2. That he does not particularly determine, what the things of *Cæſar are*, that is, what his *Right* is, as a *Soveraign Prince*. Hence ſome men conclude, that this Text can prove nothing; that we cannot learn from it, what our Saviour's Judgment was in this Point; that it is only a ſubtil Anſwer, which thoſe who ask the Queſtion could make nothing of;

which was a proper return to their ensnaring Question. This, I think, is as great a Reproach to our Saviour, as they can well cast upon him, that he, who was the Wisdom of God, the great *Prophet* and *Teacher* of Mankind, should return as Sophistical and doubtful Answers, as the *Heathen Oracles*, and that in a Case, which required, and would admit a very plain Answer. It is true, many times our Saviour, when he discourst of what concerned his own Person, or the Mysteries of his Kingdom, which were not fit at that time to be publisht in plain terms, used a mystical Language; as when he called his Body the *Temple*, or he taught them by *Parables*, which were not obvious at the first hearing, but still what he said, had a certain and determined sense, and what was obscure and difficult, he explained privately to his Apostles, that in due time they might explain it to others; but to assert, as these men must do, That Christ gave them such an Answer as signifyed nothing, and which he intended they should understand nothing by, shews that they are not so Civil to our Saviour as these *Pharisees* and *Herodians* were, who at least owned in Complement, *Master*,

we

we know that thou art true, and teacheſt the way of God in Truth, neither careſt thou for any Man, for thou regardeſt not the Perſon of Men.

But certainly the *Phariſees* did believe, that there was ſomething in our Saviour's Anſwer; for *they marvelled, and left him, and went their way:* and yet thoſe who had wit enough to ask ſuch enſnaring Queſtions, could not be ſo dull as to be put off with a Sophiſtical Anſwer, (an Art below the Gravity of our Saviour's Perſon and Office) but would have urged it a little further, had they not been ſenſible, that they were ſufficiently anſwered, and had nothing to reply.

For indeed, can any thing be plainer than our Saviour's Anſwer? They ask him, Whether it were lawful to pay Tribute to *Cæſar?* he does not indeed in expreſs words ſay, that they ſhould pay Tribute to *Cæſar*, but he gives them ſuch an Anſwer, as withal convinc'd them of the Reaſon and Neceſſity of it. He asks whoſe Image and Superſcription was on the Tribute-money; they tell him *Cæſar's*; from whence he infers, *Render therefore unto* Cæſar *the things that are* Cæſar's. *Therefore? wherefore?* becauſe the

the Tribute-money had *Cæsar*'s Image on it; therefore they must render to *Cæsar the things that are Cæsar*'s; which certainly signifies that *Tribute* was one of those things which belonged to *Cæsar*, and must be rendred to him, as appeared by it's having *Cæsar*'s Image: not as if every thing that had *Cæsar*'s Mark and Stamp on it, did belong to *Cæsar*, and must be given to him, (as some Men profanely enough, how wittily soever they imagine, Burlesque and Ridicule our Saviour's Answer) for at this rate all the Money of the Empire, which bore his Image, was *Cæsar*'s; but the Money which was stampt with *Cæsar*'s Image, and was the currant Money of the Nation, was a plain sign, as I observed before, that he was their Soveraign, and paying *Tribute* was a known Right due to *Soveraign Princes*; and therefore the very Money which they used, with *Cæsar*'s Image on it, resolved that Question, not only of the lawfulness, but the necessity of paying *Tribute*: and this was so plain an Answer, that the *Pharisees* were ashamed of their Question, and went away without making any Reply; for they no more dared to deny that *Cæsar* was their King, than they thought

thought he dared either to own or deny the lawfulneſs of paying *Tribute* to *Cæſar*. And this was all the ſubtilty of our Saviour's Anſwer.

But then our Saviour, not confining his Anſwer meerly to the caſe of paying *Tribute*, but anſwering in general, That we muſt render to *Cæſar* the things that are *Cæſar's*, extends this to all the *Rights* of *Soveraign Princes*, and ſo becomes a ſtanding rule in all caſes, to give to *Cæſar* what is *Cæſar's* due. And when our Saviour commands us to *render to* Cæſar *the things which are* Cæſar's, without telling us what *Cæſar's* things are, this is ſo far from making his Anſwer doubtful and ambiguous, and of no uſe in this preſent Controverſie, that it ſuggeſts to us three plain and natural Conſequences, which are ſufficient to end this whole Diſpute.

1. That our Saviour did not intend to make any alteration in the Rights of *Soveraignty*, but what *Rights* he found *Soveraign Princes* poſſeſt of, he leaves them in the quiet poſſeſſion of; for had he intended to make any change in this matter, he would not have given ſuch a general Rule, *to render to* Cæſar *the things which are* Cæſar's, without ſpecifying what theſe things are.

2. And

2. And therefore he leaves them to the known Laws of the Empire to determine what is *Cæsar's* Right. Whatever is essential to the Notion of *Soveraign Power*, whatever the Laws and Customs of Nations determine to be *Cæsar's* Right, that they must render to him; for he would make no alteration in this matter. So that Subjection to *Princes*, and *Non-resistance*, is as plainly determined by our Saviour in this Law, as paying *Tribute*; for Subjection and *Non-resistance* is as essential a *Right* of *Soveraign Power*, and as inseparable from the Notion of it, as any thing can be. So it is acknowledged by the Laws and Customs of Nations, and so it is determined by the Apostle St. *Paul*, as I shall shew hereafter.

3. I observe farther, That when our Saviour joyns our Duty to our *Prince*, with our Duty to our God, *render to* Cæsar *the things which are* Cæsar's, *and to God the things which are God's*, he excepts nothing from *Cæsar's Right*, which by the Laws of Nations is due to Sovereign Princes, but what is a violation of, and an encroachment on Gods Right and Soveraignty; that is, we must pay all that Obedience and Subjection to *Princes*,

Princes, which is consistent with our Duty to God. This is the only limit our Saviour sets to our Duty to *Princes*. If they should command us to renounce our Religion, and worship false Gods; if they should challenge Divine Honours to themselves, as some of the *Roman Emperours* did; this we must not do, because it is to renounce Obedience and Subjection to God, who has a more Soveraign Power, and a greater Right in us, than our *Prince*: But all Active and Passive Obedience, which is consistent with a good Conscience towards God, and required of us by the Laws of our *Country*, and the essential Rights of Soveraignty, is what we owe to our *Prince*, and what by our Saviour's Command we must render to him. This I hope is sufficient for the Explication of our Saviour's Answer to the *Pharisees* and *Herodians*, which evidently contains the Doctrine of Obedience and Subjection to *Princes*, enforced on us by the Authority of our Saviour himself.

2. Our Saviour's Rebuke to St. *Peter* when he drew his Sword and struck a Servant of the High Priest and smote off his Ear, is as plain a Declaration against Resistance, as words can make it, 26 *Mat.* 52.

52. *Then said Jesus unto him, Put up thy Sword into his place: for all they that take the Sword, shall perish with the Sword.* For the understanding of which, we must consider upon what occasion St. *Peter* drew his Sword: for we must not think that our Saviour does absolutely forbid the use of the Sword, which is to destroy all Civil Governments, and the Power of *Princes*, and to proclaim impunity to all the Villanies which were committed in the World. The Sword is necessary to punish Wickedness, and to protect the Innocent. In the hands of *Princes* it is an Instrument of Justice, as St. *Paul* tells us, *That they bear not the Sword in vain, but are the Ministers of God, Revengers to execute Wrath upon him that doeth Evil*, 13 *Rom.* 4. In the hands of private Persons it may be lawfully used in Self-defence. Thus our Saviour, a little before his Crucifixion, gave Commission to his Disciples to furnish themselves with Swords, though they parted with their Garment for the Purchase, 22 *Luke* 36. Which we may suppose was not design'd as a meer modish and fashionable thing, but to defend themselves from the private Assaults of Robbers, and such-like common Enemies, who, as *Josephus* tells

us,

us, were very numerous at that time. For no Man wants Authority to defend his Life againſt him who has no Authority to take it away.

But the caſe of St. *Peter* was very different: he drew his Sword indeed in his *Maſter*'s defence, but againſt a lawful Authority. The Officers of the *Chief Prieſts* and *Phariſees* came with *Judas* to the place where *Jeſus* was, to ſeize on him. This was a lawful Authority, though employed upon a very unjuſt Errand; but Authority muſt not be reſiſted, though in Defence of the greateſt Innocence. Men who draw their Swords againſt lawful Powers, ſhall periſh with the Sword. Which does not ſignifie what the Event ſhall always be, but what is the Deſert and Merit of the Action. *Rebels* may ſometimes be proſperous, but they always deſerve Puniſhment; and if they eſcape the Sword in this World, St. *Paul* tells us, they ſhall receive Damnation in the next.

What can be ſaid more expreſly againſt Reſiſtance than this? St. *Peter* never could have drawn his Sword in a better Cauſe, never in the defence of a more Sacred Perſon. If we may defend oppreſs'd Innocence againſt a lawful Authority,

rity, if we may oppose unjust and illegal violence, if any Obligations of Friendship, Gratitude, or Religion it self could justifie Resistance, St. *Peter* had not met with this Rebuke. What, should he tamely suffer his Lord and Master to be betrayed, the most admirable Example of universal Righteousness and Goodness that ever appeared in the World? Shall one who had done no evil, who had neither offended against the Laws of God nor Men, who had spent his whole time in doing good, be so barbarously used, and treated like the vilest Malefactor? Shall he who was so famous for Miracles, who gave Eyes to the Blind, and Feet to the Lame, shall he who was the great Prophet sent from God to instruct the World, shall their dear Master be haled away from them, and they stand by, and see it, and suffer it? Thus might S. *Peter* have argued for himself. But tho' it was a very unjust Action, yet it was done by a just Authority: and lawful Powers must not be resisted, tho' it were in Defence of the Saviour of the World. And if St. *Peter* might not use the Sword in Defence of Christ's Person, there is much less pretence to fight for his Religion: for though some call this fighting for Religion,

gion, it is only fighting for themſelves. Men may keep their Religion, if they pleaſe, in deſpite of earthly Powers; and therefore no Powers can hurt Religion, though they may perſecute the Profeſſors of it: And therefore when men take up arms to avoid perſecution, it is not in defence of Religion, but of themſelves; that is, to avoid their ſuffering for Religion. And if St. *Peter* might not fight to preſerve Chriſt himſelf, certainly neither he nor we might take up arms to defend ourſelves from perſecution. Chriſt was the firſt *Martyr* for his own Religion; his Perſon was infinitely more ſacred and inviolable than any of us can pretend to be. And if St. *Peter* muſt not fight for Chriſt, certainly we muſt not fight for ourſelves, though we abſurdly enough call it fighting for our Religion.

And who were theſe Powers St. *Peter* reſiſted? They were onely the Servants and Officers of the *High-Prieſt*. The High-Prieſt did not appear there himſelf; much leſs *Pilate*, much leſs *Cæſar*: and yet our Saviour rebukes St. *Peter* for reſiſting the inferiour Officers, tho' they offered the moſt unjuſt and illegal violence. It ſeems, he did not under-

ſtand our modern diſtinctions between the *Perſon* and the *Authority* of a *Prince*: That though his Perſon be ſacred, and muſt not be toucht, yet his Miniſters, who act by his authority, may be oppoſed. We may fight his Navies, and demoliſh his Garriſons, and kill his Subjects, who fight for him, though we muſt not touch his Perſon. But he is a mock-*Prince*, whoſe Authority is confined to his own Perſon, who can do nothing more than what he can do with his two hands; which cannot anſwer the ends of Government. A *Prince* is not meerly a natural, but a Political perſon, and his perſonal Authority reaches as far as his Commiſſion does. His Officers and Miniſters of State, and Commanders, and Souldiers are his hands, and eyes, and ears, and legs; and he who reſiſteth thoſe who act by his Commiſſion, may as properly be ſaid to reſiſt the perſonal Authority of the *Prince*, as if he himſelf were preſent in his natural Perſon, as well as by his Authority. Thus our Saviour, it ſeems, thought, when he rebuked St. *Peter* for ſtriking a ſervant of the *High-Prieſt*, and ſmiting off his ear.

And if S. *Peter* were rebuk'd for this, how comes

comes the *Pope* to challenge the Sword in St. *Peter*'s right, when our *Saviour* would not allow S. *Peter* to use it himself? And if St. *Peter* might not draw his sword against an inferiour Officer, by what Authority does the Pope pretend to dispose of Crowns and Scepters, and to trample on the Necks of the greatest Monarchs? And I suppose the *Presbyter* can challenge no more Authority than the *Pope*. Whether they will allow St. *Peter* to have been a *Bishop* or *Presbyter*, this command to put up his Sword, equally concerns him in all capacities, and ought to secure Soveraign Princes from the unjust Usurpations and treacherous Conspiracies both of *GENEVA* and *ROME*.

There is but one Objection, that I know of, against all this from the Doctrine of our Saviour, and that is, that he seems to disallow that very Authority which is exercised by *secular Princes*; and therefore cannot be thought such a severe Preacher of Obedience & Subjection: for Authority and Subjection are correlates, they have a mutual respect to each other; and therefore they must stand or fall together. There is no Authority where there is no subjection due, & there can be no subjection due, where there is

no authority. And yet this is the Doctrine which Christ taught his Disciples, 20 *Mat.* 25, 26, 27, 28 *v. Ye know that the Princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great, exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister. And whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant. Even as the son of man came not to be ministred unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.* This Text has been press'd to serve as many ill purposes, as most *Texts* in the *Bible*; and therefore deserves to be carefully considered. Some hence infer, that it is unlawful for a Christian to be a *Magistrate*, or a *King*. As if our Saviour either intended that humane Societies should be deprived of the Advantages of Government, which is the greatest temporal blessing and security to mankind; or had made it necessary that some men should continue Heathens and Infidels, that they might govern Christians: which I doubt would be a sore temptation to many to renounce Christianity, if they could gain a temporal Crown by it.

Others from hence conclude, that there

there must be no *superiority of degree* between the Ministers of the Gospel, but they must be all *equal*; as if because the Apostles were to be all equal, without any superiority over each other, therefore they were to have no superiority over inferiour Ministers. As if because the *Apostles* might not exercise such a secular Power and Soveraignty as the *Kings of the Gentiles* did, therefore there must be no different degrees of Power in the *Ministers* of the *Church*; that is, that because secular and spiritual Power differ in the whole kind, therefore there are no different degrees of spiritual Power. As if *Christ* himself were not superiour to his *Apostles*, because he did not assume to himself the secular Authority of earthly Princes; but came not to be ministred unto, but to minister, as he commands them to do according to his example.

Others conclude, that at least *Christian Princes* must not usurp such a Soveraign, and absolute, and uncontroulable Power as the *Princes of the Gentiles* did, but must remember that they are but the Publick Servants and Ministers of the Common-wealth, and may be resisted, and called to an account by their

People for the male-administration of Government. But how they infer this, I confess, I cannot tell: for it is evident our Saviour does not here speak one word in derogation to that civil power and authority which was exercised by *secular Princes*. He tells us indeed, that the *Princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them*, and *they that are great, exercise authority upon them*: But does he blame the exercise of this authority? Does he set any narrower bounds or limits, than what the *Heathen Princes* challenged? By no means; he says not one word of any such matter. St. *Matthew* indeed expresses this power of *Princes* by κατακυριεύουσιν, and κατεξουσιάζουσιν, which some think intimates the abuse of their authority: but S. *Luke* renders it by κυριεύουσιν, and ἐξουσιάζουσιν, which only signifies the exercise of *soveraign power*. And though most of the *Roman Emperours* were guilty of very great miscarriages in Government, yet our Saviour onely refers to that lawful authority wherewith they were invested, not to the abuse of it: and therefore he takes notice of that honourable Title which was given to many *Roman Emperours*, that they were called Εὐεργέται, or Benefactors; which

which certainly does not argue his dislike of civil Authority. But all that our Saviour tells his Disciples is, that it should not be so among them, that they should not exercise such a secular power and authority as earthly Princes do. Now is it any disparagement to *Kingly Power*, to tell a *Bishop* that he must not exercise such a soveraign authority over the Church, as the *Prince* does over the State? which is the whole of what our Saviour intended in this place.

For the occasion of these words, St. *Matthew* tells us, was to check that vain Ambition of *Zebedee's two sons*, who came to *Christ*, and employed their *Mother* to ask of him, *that one might sit on his right hand, and the other on his left hand, in his kingdom*; that is, that they might have the greatest places of dignity and power next himself. St. *Luke* tells us, that it was to compose that strife and contention which was among them, which of them should be accounted the greatest; which most likely refers to the same story, though it is plain they quarrelled more than once about this matter. And the occasion of all these quarrels, was a mistake of the nature of *Christ's Kingdom*. They, as well as

the rest of the *Jews*, expected their *Messias* should be a *Temporal Prince*; and *they* being convinced by the Miracles of *Christ*, that he was indeed the *Messias who was to come*, they lived in daily expectation when he would take the *Kingdom* upon himself; and then they did not doubt but that they should be the *chief Ministers of State*, and have the greatest places of trust and power in his *Kingdom*: and this made them jealous of each others greatness, and so forward to bespeak Preferments for themselves. Now to cure these earthly ambitions, he tells them, that his *Kingdom* was no such thing as they dreamt of, and that he had no such Preferments for them as they expected.

Earthly Princes lived in great Pomp and Splendour, and had great Places of trust and honour to bestow on their Servants; but they saw no such thing in him: *he came not to be ministred unto, but to minister*, to live a mean, industrious, and laborious life, and to die as a Malefactor, *and give his life a ransome for many*. And they could not expect by being his Servants, to be advanced to secular Power and Authority, which he had not himself; but when he came into his

King-

Kingdom, they ſhould indeed ſhare with him in his Power and Authority; *they ſhould ſit upon twelve Thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Iſrael:* that is, they ſhould have the Supreme Authority in his Church, which is his Spiritual Kingdom. But there was nothing of external ſtate and grandeur in this, as they expected; but it was a life of humility and modeſty, and contempt of this world, and earthly greatneſs. The greateſt Miniſters in his Kingdom muſt be as humble as a child, as he elſewhere tells them, and as diligent and induſtrious, and condeſcending, as the meaneſt ſervant, and ſhould very often differ nothing from ſervants in their external fortune and condition of life. This is the ſum of what our Saviour here teaches his Diſciples; and he is a wonderful man, and very quick-ſighted, who can diſcover any reflection on Civil Power and Authority in all this.

I ſhall onely obſerve farther, that when our Saviour calls them here, the *Princes* and *Kings of the Gentiles or Nations*, he does not ſpeak this in diſparagement of them, that they were only *Heathen* and *Infidel Princes*, who did this: for there were no other Princes

at

at that time in the world. *Heathen* and *Pagan Princes* sounds now as a Note of Infamy, whereby they are distinguished from *Christian Kings and Princes*; but the *Kings* of the *Gentiles* or *Nations* in our Saviour's time, signified no more than *Soveraign Princes*, who were invested with civil authority: And our Saviour only distinguishes between that civil power and authority which was exercised by *secular Princes*, and that *spiritual Kingdom* which he was now about to erect in the World; and the distinction had been of the same force, though there had been at that time Jewish or Christian, as well as Heathen Princes. Still the difference between Civil and Ecclesiastical Authority is the same; and no Apostle, or Bishop, as such, can challenge the power or authority of earthly Princes, or any share in it.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

What we may learn from our Saviour's Practice about NON-RESISTANCE.

HAving seen what the Doctrine of our Saviour was, let us now consider his *Practice.* And we need not doubt but our Saviour lived, as he preacht. He taught his Disciples by his Example, as well as by his Laws. His Life was the best Comment upon his Sermons, was a visible Lecture of universal righteousness and goodness; and it is impossible to conceive a more perfect and absolute example of *Subjection* and *Non-Resistance*, than our Saviour has set us.

When our Saviour appeared in the World, the *Jews* were very weary of the *Roman Yoke*, and in earnest expectation of their *Messias*, who, as they thought, would restore the Kingdom again unto *Israel*; and this expectation of their *Messias*, whom they mistook for a *Temporal*

poral Prince, made them very apt to join with any one, who pretended to be the *Messias*, and to rebel against the *Roman* Government. Such most likely were *Theudas* and *Judas* of *Galilee*, of whom we have mention, 5 *Acts* 36, 37. and it is not impossible but the *Ægyptian*, who led 4000 men into the Wilderness, 2 *Acts* 38. either pretended to be the *Messias*, or some fore-runner of him: to be sure, such were those *false Christs*, and *false Prophets*, of whom our Saviour warns his Disciples, 24 *Matth.* 23. *Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo here is Christ, or there, believe it not.*

This being the temper of the *Jewish Nation* at that time, so extreamly inclined to *Seditions*, and *Rebellion* against the *Roman* Powers, how easie had it been for our Saviour, had he pleased, to have made himself very potent and formidable! how easie could he have gained even the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* to his Party, (whose great quarrel was at his meanness and poverty) would he once have declared himself a temporal Prince, and invaded the Throne! But he was so far from this, that when he perceived the People had an intention to take him by force and make him a King, he with-

drew

drew himſelf privately from them, *and departed into a mountain himſelf alone*, 6 John 15. and yet I preſume, there might have been as many plauſible pretences to have juſtified a *Rebellion* then, as ever there were in any *Nation* ſince. He had at that time fed *five thouſand men, beſides women and children, with five barley loaves and two ſmall fiſhes*: and what a formidable Enemy would he have been, who could Victual an Army by Miracles, and could, when he pleaſed, conquer by the ſame miraculous Power alſo! this the People, whom he had miraculouſly fed, were very ſenſible of, and did hence conclude, that *he was the Prophet that ſhould come into the World*, and that it was time to take him, and ſet him upon the Throne: but though our *Saviour* was indeed the *Meſſias*, yet he was not ſuch a *Meſſias*, as they expected; he was not a temporal Prince, and therefore would not countenance their *Rebellion* againſt *Cæſar*, though it were to make himſelf a *King*.

It is ſufficiently known, that Chriſt ſubmitted to the moſt unjuſt ſentence, to the moſt ignominious and painful death, rather than reſiſt the *Higher Powers*, though he could ſo eaſily have *called for*

Le-

Legions of Angels to his rescue, But he went as a lamb to the slaughter, and as the sheep before the shearer is dumb, so he opened not his mouth: when he was reviled, he reviled not again; when he suffered he threatned not, but committed himself to him who judgeth righteously. He rebuked *Peter* when he drew his Sword in his defence, and tells *Pilate* the reason, why he was so easily apprehended, and used at their pleasure, without any resistance and opposition, though he had been formerly attended with such crouds of his *Disciples*; Because he was no *Temporal Prince*, and therefore did not require his *Disciples* to fight for him, as other *Temporal Princes* used to do. *Jesus answered, My Kingdom is not of this world: if my Kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now is my Kingdom not from hence*, 18 John 36. Which plainly shews, that our Saviour's subjection was not matter of force and constraint, because he wanted power to resist; but it was matter of choice, that which was most agreeable to the nature of his *Kingdom*, which was not to be propagated by carnal weapons, but by suffering and death.

And

And when our *Saviour* has ſet us ſuch an example as this, it is wonderful to me, that any, who call themſelves his *Diſciples*, can think it lawful to *Rebel* againſt their *Prince*, and defend themſelves from the moſt unjuſt violence by a more unjuſt reſiſtance. But there are few men, who are contented to follow Chriſt to the Croſs; they do not like that part of his example, and are willing to perſwade themſelves, that they are not bound to imitate it. And there are two things, which I find urged by ſome men to this purpoſe, which muſt be briefly conſidered.

1. That it is no wonder, that Chriſt ſuffered patiently and quietly without reſiſting the moſt unjuſt violence, becauſe he came into the world to die, and to make his Soul an offering for ſin. And how could ſo innocent a perſon die, but by the hands of *unjuſt* and *Tyrannical Powers?* and it was inconſiſtent with his deſign of dying for ſin, to reſiſt and oppoſe. This is the account our Saviour himſelf gives of his patient ſuffering. When St. *Peter* drew his Sword in his defence, he tells him, *Thinkeſt thou, that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he ſhall preſently give me more than twelve*

Le-

Legions of Angels? But how then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be? 26 Matth. 43. 54. *And the cup which my Father has given me, shall I not drink it?* 18 Joh. 11. But what is this now to us? Our *Saviour* did not resist the most *unjust* and *tyrannical* Powers, because God had decreed he should die by their hands, and he came into the World for this very purpose; but has God as peremptorily decreed, that we must suffer also by unjust violence? were we born for this very end, to suffer death by *Herods* and *Pontius Pilates*? to be the *Slaves* and *Vassals*, the *Scorn* and the *Triumph* of insolent *Tyrants*? certainly God had a greater care and regard for Mankind than so: and then our case is very different from our Saviour's; and though he died patiently, we may defend our Lives, and our Liberties, which are as dear as our Lives, if we can.

2. And therefore they add, that Christ took upon himself the person not only of a private man, but of a servant, that he might make us free, and that not only as to our *Spiritual*, but as to our *Civil Liberties*, as the *Virgin Mary* sings: *He hath shewed strength with his arm, he hath scattered the proud in the imagination*

on

on of their heart; he hath put down the Mighty from their Seats, and hath exalted them of low Degree, 1 *Luke* 51, 52. which they think, does not ſignifie that Chriſt has eſtabliſhed *Tyrants* in their *Thrones*, and ſubjected Chriſtians to the vileſt Slavery. As Chriſt has taught us by his Example to bear Servitude and Sufferings with an equal Mind, when we cannot help it; ſo he has not forbid us to vindicate and recover our *natural Rights* and *Liberties*, when we can, according to the expreſs Direction of St. *Paul*, *Art thou called being a Servant? care not for it: but if thou mayeſt be made free, uſe it rather. Ye are bought with a price, be not ye the Servants of Men*, 1 *Cor.* 7. 21, 23.

Now in Anſwer to this, we may conſider in general, that if all this proves any thing, it proves, that *Chriſt* did not intend, that his ſufferings ſhould be an example to us: and yet St. *Peter* expreſly tells us, that he did; *Chriſt alſo ſuffered for us, leaving us an example, that we ſhould follow his ſteps*, and wherein we muſt imitate Chriſt in ſuffering, he tells us in the ſame place, *viz. in ſuffering wrongfully, in taking it patiently, when we do well, and ſuffer for it*, 1 *Pet.* 2. 19, 20, 21.

And I think S. *Peter*'s Authority in this Case is better then all the Arguments that can be urged against it; and therefore whether we could answer these Arguments, or no, yet it is evident, that they are not good, because they prove that which is manifestly false, that Christ is not our Example in Suffering, when St. *Peter* tells us, that he is: but yet it is a mighty satisfaction, not only to know, that an Argument is false, but to discover, wherein the falacy consists; and therefore I shall give a more particular Answer to these Objections.

1. As for their first Argument, That *Christ* came into the World on purpose to die as a Sacrifice for Sin, and therefore it was inconsistent with his Design, and the Person he undertook to Resist and Oppose, had it been never so lawful to resist; I grant it is very true, but yet this does not prove, that he cannot be our Example in suffering. For,

1. This is not the only Reason our Saviour gives of his *Non-resistance*, and patient Suffering. He gives *Peter* another Reason, Because it is unlawful to draw the Sword against a just Authority, though our Cause be never so just: *Put up thy Sword again into his place, for all*

all they that take the Sword ſhall periſh by the Sword; which I have already explained to you at large. So that our Saviour acknowledges it as unlawful to reſiſt a lawful Authority, as it was inconſiſtent with his Deſign of dying for the ſins of Men; and herein certainly he is fit to be our Example, in not Reſiſting a lawful Authority in his own Defence.

2. I grant, it had not been agreeable to the *Perſon* which our Saviour took, to have avoided Death by a forcible Reſiſtance; but then our Saviour voluntarily took ſuch a Perſon, as was fit to be an Example to us. His *Perſon* and his *Religion* were very well ſuited to each other; a meek, humble, ſuffering *Perſon*, to be an Example of a meek, humble, and ſuffering *Religion*. His *Perſon* and External Circumſtances of his Appearance were on purpoſe fitted to his *Religion*; and it is none of the leaſt Wonders of the Divine Wiſdom, that the Work of our Redemption was accompliſht in ſuch a *myſterious way*, as at once made our Saviour the Author of our Redemption, and an Example of all the Graces and Vertues of the Chriſtian Life.

Might not theſe men, if they pleaſed, by the ſame Argument prove, That

Chriſt is not to be our Example in meekneſs and poverty, and contempt of this World, and forgiving Enemies, *&c.* becauſe he came into the World on this deſign, *not to be miniſtred unto, but to miniſter?* He choſe a mean and low Fortune; and all the Affronts and Indignities he ſuffered, were part of his voluntary *humiliation*, and therefore it became him to bear them patiently, and to forgive them, as much as it did to die patiently by wicked hands; but there is not the ſame reaſon for us to do ſo: and thus it will be hard to find any thing, wherein Chriſt is to be our Example, becauſe the very reaſon of his coming into the World, the Manner and Circumſtances of his Appearance, all that he did and ſuffered, may be reſolved into the Decree and Appointment of God, and his voluntary undertaking, and the Accompliſhment of ancient *Types* and *Prophecies*; and therefore he is no more to be an Example to us, than a man who acts the part of a *Beggar* or of a *Prince*, is to be an Example to all that ſee him.

But methinks it is worth conſidering, why *Chriſt* choſe ſuch a Perſon as this. Why he was born of mean and obſcure Parents, and choſe a poor and induſtrious Life,

Life, and an accurſed and infamous Death? was it impoſſible for *infinite Wiſdom* to have laid a more glorious and triumphant Scene of our Redemption? was there no poſſible way, but the Condeſcenſion and Sufferings of his own Son? Let thoſe ſay that, who dare venture to determine, what infinite Wiſdom can do. It is enough for me to know, that Chriſt took ſuch a mean and ſuffering Perſon upon him, becauſe it was moſt agreeable to the Religion, which he preacht, and of which he was to be an Example; and therefore though Chriſt ſuffered for other Reaſons, and to other Ends and Purpoſes, than we do or can ſuffer, yet his Sufferings are an Example to us, becauſe God choſe to ſave and redeem us by the Sufferings of his Son, not only that he might expiate our ſins by his Blood, but alſo that he might be an Example to us of Meekneſs, and Patience, and Submiſſion to the Divine Will, and Subjection to Government, even in the moſt unjuſt and infamous Sufferings.

3. We may conſider further, That *Chriſt*'s ſuffering in obedience to the will and appointment of God, does not make him unfit to be our Example. For

though God has not so peremptorily decreed, that all Christians should suffer, as he did that Christ should suffer, yet whenever we are called forth to suffer, (as we always are, when we cannot avoid suffering without resisting a lawful Authority) our sufferings are as much the effects of God's decree and appointment, as the sufferings of Christ were; and in such Cases every Christian may, and ought to say, as his Lord did, *The Cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?* Thus St. *Peter* expresly tells the *Christians* to whom he wrote, and gives it as a Reason, why they should suffer patiently, *even for doing well. For even hereunto were you called, because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that we should follow his steps*, 1 Pet 2.21. Now *calling* in the *New Testament* signifies the *choice* and *election* of *God*, and always supposes a Divine *Decree*, *Appointment*, and *Constitution*, as the foundation of it. Thus St. *Paul* tells us, that the Gifts and Calling (κλῆσις) of God are without repentance, 11 *Rom* 29. that is, that Decree he made to choose the Posterity of *Abraham* for his People, which still intitled all those of them to the Blessings of the Gospel, who would believe

lieve in *Christ*. Thus the ſtate of Chriſtianity is our Calling, and holy Calling, 2 *Tim.* 1. 9. 3 *Heb.* 1. becauſe it is the *way* and *means* God hath choſen and appointed for the Salvation of Mankind: and Chriſtians are often ſtiled the *Called*, becauſe God has now decreed to chuſe all the ſincere Diſciples of Chriſt, as he formerly did the Poſterity of *Abraham*, to be his peculiar People; and throughout the Scriptures of the New Teſtament, God is never ſaid to *call*, nor any one to be *called of God*, but with reſpect to ſome Divine *Decree* and *Conſtitution*; and therefore when St. *Peter* tells the Chriſtians, that they are *called to ſuffer*, it ſignifies that God has appointed them to it, by his poſitive Will and Decree.

This St. *Paul* diſcourſes more at large in his Epiſtle to the *Romans*, and comforts them under their Sufferings from this very Conſideration, That the Sufferings which they underwent, were not the effects of meer Chance and Accident, nor of the Wickedneſs and Injuſtice of Men, or barely of God's permiſſion, but of his decree and appointment; and therefore they might certainly conclude, That whatever their Sufferings were, they ſhould turn to their good,

8 *Rom.* 28,29,30. *And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them that are called according to this purpose,* τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς, *to those who are called,* that is, to suffer, which is the Argument the *Apostle* is discoursing of, according to his Will and Pleasure and Appointment.

Sufferings are not for the good of all profest Christians, for they may tempt Hypocrites to renounce their Religion, and great and severe Sufferings may be too powerful a temptation for weak though sincere Christians; and therefore when the Rage and Malice of Men boils and swells, God sets bounds to it, and does not suffer these Persecutions and Afflictions promiscuously to light upon all Christians, but exerciseth a very particular Providence in chusing out fit Persons to suffer, in directing the storm and tempest of Persecution to fall where he pleases, upon such Persons, who are armed with Faith and Patience to resist its fury, and to bear and conquer its Rage. And such Persons, who are thus appointed, who are thus *called* by God to suffer, shall be sure to conquer, and to receive the Reward of Conquerours. For thus the Apostle adds, *For whom he did*

did foreknow, he alſo did predeſtinate to be conformed to the Image of his Son, that he might be the Firſt-born among many Brethren. This Conformity to the Image of Chriſt in this place, does plainly ſignifie a Conformity to him in Sufferings, as is evident from the whole ſcope of the place. Some Perſons it ſeems there are, whom God does predeſtinate or fore-appoint to be conformed to the ſufferings of Chriſt: for this is not the actual Portion of all Chriſtians, though it is the Condition of our Diſcipleſhip; and they are thoſe whom he did foreknow. Now the fore-knowledge of God includes his Choice and Election; he chuſes out of the Body of Chriſtians, ſome fit perſons to make his Martyrs and Confeſſors, to be Examples of Faith and Patience and Courage to the World, *And whom he did predeſtinate, them he alſo called; and whom he called, them he alſo juſtified; and whom he juſtified, them he alſo glorified*; that is, thoſe perſons whom God thus chuſes, and pre-ordains to ſuffer as Chriſt did, in time he calls forth to ſuffer; and when he does ſo, he *juſtifies* them, that is, he brings them off with triumph and victory, and owns and applauds their Faith and Patience. For

ſo

so δικαιοῦν sometimes signifies, and therefore to be *justified*, is expounded by to conquer and overcome, 3 *Rom.* 4. *That thou mightest be justified* (ἵνα δικαιωθῇς) *in thy sayings, and mightest overcome when thou art judged.* And indeed this is properly to be *justified* in any trial or combate, to overcome and conquer; and that God who gives the victory, gives the reward too; and whom he *justifies*, them he also *glorifies*: which seems to refer not to those rewards which are common to all Christians, but to some peculiar degree of Glory, which is prepared for such Conquerors, as the Apostle speaks; *If so be, that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together*, 17 *v.*

So that though God has not made us slaves and vassals to the humor of every Tyrant, yet all the afflictions and sufferings of Christians, especially those which befal them on the account of Religion, are as particularly ordered and determined by God, as the sufferings of Christ himself were: and therefore there is no difference upon this account between the sufferings of Christ, and the sufferings of his Disciples; and therefore though Christ came into the World on purpose to suffer in obedience to the Di-

Divine Will, this does not make him ever the leſs fit to be an Example to us. Nay, his Obedience to the Will of God in ſuffering the hardeſt things from the moſt Unjuſt and Tyrannical Powers, is an Example to us of the ſame patient Suffering, and ſubmiſſion to the Will of God.

It is true, none of us in particular can know that God has Decreed, that we ſhall ſuffer ſuch or ſuch things, and from ſuch or ſuch hands, as our Saviour did; but yet this we know, that it is God's will and pleaſure, that we ſhould patiently endure thoſe Sufferings, which we cannot avoid without ſin; and ſince he has forbid us by expreſs Laws to reſiſt the higher Powers, whatever ſufferings cannot be avoided without Reſiſtance, it is God's will and pleaſure, that we ſhould ſubmit to them. And ſince none of theſe ſufferings, which are unavoidable to us, befal us without the particular Decree and Appointment of God, we have reaſon, in imitation of our great Maſter, to ſubmit to them with the ſame cheerfulneſs and ſelf-reſignation as he did.

There is ſomething indeed in the example of our Saviour, which in our cir-

circumstances we are not bound to imitate. For he punctually knowing, what God's Will and Pleasure was concerning him, voluntarily chose that Condition, which he so well knew, God had allotted for him. He freely chose a mean and servile Fortune, he chose Suffering and Death; when his time of offering up himself was come, he went up to *Jerusalem* on purpose to die there; but we are not bound to choose Poverty and Disgrace and Suffering, we are not bound voluntarily to deliver up our selves into the hands of *Tyrants* and *Persecutors*, who thirst after our Blood. We may and ought to use all just and honest Arts to make our Condition easie and comfortable in the World, and to avoid the Rage and Fury of Bloody Men, because we cannot tell, that it is the Will and Appointment of God, that we shall suffer, till our Sufferings are unavoidable; and then when we must either suffer or sin, when we must either renounce our Religion, or resist the Powers, we must embrace Suffering and Death, as that Portion which God has allotted for us.

I shall only observe, by the way, what a mighty Security this is to all good Christians, how *absolute* or *tyrannical*

nical ſoever the Power be under which they live; that they are ſafe in God's hands, and all the Powers of Men and Devils cannot touch them, till God by a poſitive Decree appoints and orders their ſuffering. There could not be greater nor more abſolute *Tyrants* than the *Roman Emperours* were at this time, and yet they had no power over the meaneſt Chriſtian, but by an expreſs Commiſſion from Heaven. This is the ſpecial Priviledge of the Chriſtian Church above the reſt of Mankind, that they are God's peculiar Care and Charge; that he does not permit any Sufferings or Perſecutions to befal them, but what he himſelf orders and appoints. It is a great Security to the World, that there is no evil happens to Men but what God permits, and that he permits nothing but what he can over-rule to wiſe and good ends; but it is a greater happineſs to have our Condition immediately allotted by God. God may permit a great many Evils to befal us in Anger and Diſpleaſure; but when he takes us into his immediate protection, and under his own Government, whatever Evils he appoints for us, whoever are the Inſtruments of them, are certainly

tainly for our good: and therefore there is no such danger in the Doctrine of *Non-resistance*, as some men imagine. How *absolute* soever this may be thought to render *Princes*, sincere Christians can suffer nothing by it: for they shall suffer nothing, more nor less, than what God appoints for them to suffer.

2. It is also urged against the Obligation of our Saviour's Example to suffer as he did, that Christ by his state of Servitude and Sufferings, has purchas'd Liberty for us; and that not only a Spiritual and Internal, but an External and Civil Liberty. We are no longer bound to submit to *Usurping* and *Tyrannical* Powers, when we have strength and power to deliver our selves from that necessity. There is no help for it, but men who are weak and unable to resist, must obey and suffer: but this is matter of force, not of duty: We are now bought with a price, and therefore must not chuse a state of subjection and servitude to men.

1. Now in Answer to this, we may consider first, that this Obedience and Subjection to *Soveraign Princes*, either was a Duty before Christ's appearing in the World, or it was not. If it were not,

not, then our deliverance from this ſubjection to *Princes*, is no part of that Liberty which Chriſt has purchas'd for us, becauſe it was the natural right of Mankind before; and therefore there was no need of Chriſt's dying to purchaſe this, which he cannot give us a greater right to than we had before his death. If Subjection and *Non-reſiſtance* were our Duty before, and ceaſes to be our Duty now, then Chriſt by his death has cancelled the Obligations of our Duty, and purchas'd a Liberty and Freedom not to do that which now by the Laws of God or Nature we are bound to do before; that is, Chriſt by his death has abrogated not only the Ceremonial, but ſome Moral Laws; which I ſhew'd you before was contrary to the nature and deſign of his Undertaking.

2. It is ſtrangely unaccountable, how Obedience to any Law ſhould abrogate and cancel it How Chriſt by ſubjection to the higher Powers, ſhould for ever after deliver his Diſciples from the neceſſity of ſubjection, and make them free from the Authority and Government of *Princes*, whenever they diſlike their Government. A typical Law may be fulfilled, and receive its juſt accompliſhment,

plishment, and then its Obligation ceases. Thus the Death of Christ fulfilled the Levitical Sacrifices, and put an end to them: But the Authority of a Moral Law is confirmed and strengthened, not abrogated and disanulled by great Examples. When Christ quietly and patiently submitted to the most unjust Sentence, in obedience to lawful Authority, he either did well or ill in it: If he did ill, his Example indeed is not to be imitated; but if he did well, how did his doing well deliver us from the Obligation of doing well? Did his doing well, make it ill for us to do as he did? Why did not his perfect and unsinning Obedience as well deliver us from the Obligation of all the other Laws of God, as from Obedience and Subjection to *Princes*?

The *Antinomians* indeed are so absurd as to say, That Christ fulfilled all Righteousness in our stead, and that every Believer has fulfilled the Law in Christ; and therefore is not bound to fulfil it in his own Person as a Condition of Life and Salvation. But yet they are not so absurd as to say, that Christ by the righteousness of his life and death, has altered the nature of good and evil, and cancelled

celled any one Law of God. The Law is in force ſtill, and the Duty is the ſame; but the Law cannot take hold of them, nor exact a perſonal Righteouſneſs from them, becauſe they have already fulfilled the Law in Chriſt. But now theſe men muſt ſay, that Chriſt has not only fulfilled the Law of *Subjection* and *Non-reſiſtance*, as a Condition of Salvation, but has cancelled it as a Rule of Life.

3. The Death of Chriſt could not purchaſe any Civil Rights or Liberties which we had not before, nor make any change in the External Fortunes or Conditions of men. The Death of Chriſt is repreſented in Scripture, either as an Atonement or Expiation of ſin, or as the Purchaſe and Seal of the new Covenant. Now how does the Death of Chriſt, by Expiating our ſins, deliver us from Subjection to our Civil Governours? What connexion is there between the Expiation of our ſins, and our Freedom from the Authority of Princes, that he who does one, muſt be ſuppoſed to do the other?

And as for the new Covenant, where does that grant any new Franchiſes and Liberties to Subjects? Let them produce their new Charter to juſtifie their ex-

emption from subjection to Princes; let them shew any one saying in the Gospel of our Saviour, if they can, to that purpose. What the Doctrine of Christ is, you have already heard; and when Christ died to confirm the new Covenant in his Blood, it is absurd to say that he has purchased any liberties for us, but what he has expressly granted to us in his Gospel.

He does indeed promise liberty and freedom to his subjects, but it is a liberty of another nature; a liberty from the power and dominion of sin. *Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free*, 8 John 32. that is, the power of the Gospel-revelation should deliver them from the Empire of their Lusts, and give them the true government and masterry of themselves: And therefore he adds, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin. And the servant abideth not in the house for ever: but the Son abideth for ever. If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed*, 34,35,36 v.

But does not St *Paul* advise the *Corinthians* to assert even their civil and political freedom when they can, and that from this argument, that they are

the freemen of Christ; which seems to intimate, that there is such a connexion between our spiritual and civil Liberties, that it does not become Christ's freemen to be slaves and servants unto men. 1 Cor. 7. 21, 22, 23 v. *Art thou called, being a servant? care not for it: but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather. For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant is the Lord's free man: likewise also he that is called, being free, is Christ's servant. Ye are bought with a price, be not the servants of men.*

But what is it they would prove from these words? that our subjection to men is inconsistent with our freedom in Christ? that the Apostle expresly denies, *For he that is a servant, is Christ's freeman.* Or that Christ, when he made us free, did deliver us from the subjection of men? not that neither. For he does not advise Christian servants to leave their masters, as he might and ought to have done, if Christ had bestowed this civil liberty on them; but he was so far from this, that when *Onesimus* had run away from his Master *Philemon*, and was converted by St. *Paul*, and proved very useful and serviceable in the Ministry, yet he would not de-

tain him from his Master, without asking his leave: which occasioned the Epistle to *Philemon*, as you may see 10, 11, 12, *&c.* And in this place he advises the Christian Servants not to be concerned at their being Servants; which was no Injury at all to their Christian Liberty: But if they could procure their Liberty by any fair and just means, they should chuse to do it; which is upon many Accounts more desirable, especially when Christians were Servants to Heathen Masters, as it often was in those days.

But does not the Apostle expresly tell them, *Ye are bought with a price, be not ye the servants of men?* Yes, he does: but sure this cannot signifie that Servants should cast off the Authority of their Masters. For that is directly contrary to what he had advised them before, and contrary to his own practice in the Case of *Onesimus*, whom he sent back to his Master *Philemon*. But all that I understand by it, is this; That those Christian Servants who could not obtain their Freedom, should yet take care not to be Servants to the Lusts and Passions of their Heathen Masters. For though a state of Civil Bondage and Slavery

Slavery is not inconsistent with their Christian Liberty, yet to be Ministers and Servants to the Vices of Men, is: And therefore when they lay under any such Temptation (as Christians who served Heathen Masters could not long escape it) they must then remember that they are Christ's Freemen, who were bought with a price; and therefore must neither be Servants to their own Lusts, nor to the Lusts of other men. And the reason why I chuse this sense of the words, is this; because the *Apostle* opposes being bought with a price, that is, their being redeemed by Christ, or being Christ's Freemen, to their being the Servants of Men, as inconsistent with each other. And therefore their being the Servants of Men, cannot be understood of Civil Servitude, which he before had told them was not inconsistent with their Christian Liberty, but of being Servants to the Vices of Men.

But what now is all this to Subjection to *Soveraign Princes*? Does the Apostle exhort the Christians too to throw off the Civil Powers? It was possible for a Christian Servant to purchase his Liberty, or to obtain it some other lawful ways; but how can Subjects deliver themselves

from the Authority of Princes? unless they go into some Country where there is no Government, or resist and rebel against the Higher Powers where they are: Neither of which is agreeable to our Apostles Doctrine, who would not allow servants to run away from their Masters, much less rebel against them to procure their liberty.

Nor was the case the same between Christian Subjects and Soveraign Princes, and between Masters and Servants; and therefore neither is the reason the same, why Subjects should desire freedom from the Higher Powers. Servants in those days were Slaves and Vassals, and were kept in such constant attendance on their Masters, that it must needs be very difficult; besides the other temptations they were exposed to, to gain any time or liberty for attending on Christian Worship, and the instructions of the Church. But Christian Subjects are more at their own disposal, even under *Heathen Princes*; and have all that liberty, excepting the case of Persecution, which is necessary for the purposes of Religion; which yet is the only reason intimated here, why the Apostle advises Servants to procure their freedom, if they can.

To

To conclude this Argument; there were a ſort of men, even in the Apoſtles days, who boaſted mightily of their Chriſtian liberty, and thought ſcorn for a Chriſtian either to be a Servant or a Subject. For this reaſon St. *Paul* in this place inſtructs Servants, that their Chriſtian liberty is not injured by their being Servants: for this reaſon are there ſuch frequent directions to Servants to obey their Maſters. For this reaſon does St. *Peter* caution the Chriſtians againſt this pretence of Chriſtian liberty, which ſome abuſed then, as they do ſtill, to the diſturbance of Civil Governments: *As free, but not uſing your liberty for a cloak of maliciouſneſs, but as the ſervants of God.*

CHAP. IV.

What St. Paul *Preached about Non-resistance of the* Higher Powers.

HAving thus concluded what the Doctrine and Example of our Saviour was, about Subjection to the higher Powers; let us now consider the Doctrine and Example of his Apostles. Not as if the Authority and Example of our Saviour were not sufficient of it self to make a Law, but stood in need of the confirmation and additional Authority of his own Apostles; but we might justly suspect our selves mistaken in the meaning of our Saviour's words, or in the intention and design of his Sufferings, had none of his Apostles, who were immediately instructed by himself, and acquainted with the most secret Mysteries of his Kingdom, ever preacht any such Doctrine as this, of *Subjection* to *Princes*. And therefore to give you the more abundant assurance of this, I shall plainly shew you, that the Apostles taught the same Doctrine, and imitated the example of their great Master.

I ſhall begin with St. *Paul*, who has as fully declared himſelf in this matter, as it is poſſible any man can do by words, 13 Rom. 1,2. *Let every Soul be ſubject unto the higher Powers; for there is no Power but of God: the Powers that be, are ordained of God. Whoſoever therefore reſiſteth the Power, reſiſteth the Ordinance of God; and they that reſiſt, ſhall receive to themſelves Damnation.*

This is a very expreſs Teſtimony againſt Reſiſtance, and therefore I ſhall conſider it at large; for there have been various Arts uſed to pervert every word of it, and to make this Text ſpeak quite contrary to the Deſign and Intention of the Apoſtle in it: and therefore I ſhall divide the words into three general Parts.

1. The Doctrine the Apoſtle Inſtructs them in: *Let every Soul be ſubject to the higher Powers.* 2. The reaſon whereby he proves and inforces this Doctrine: *For there is no Power but of God; the Powers that be, are ordained of God. Whoſoever therefore reſiſteth the Power, reſiſteth the Ordinance of God.* 3. The Puniſhment of ſuch Reſiſtance: *And they that reſiſt ſhall receive to themſelves Damnation.*

1. I shall begin with the Doctrine, *That every Soul must be subject to the higher powers.* And here are three things to be explained. 1. Who are contained under this general expression of *every Soul.* 2. Who are meant by *the higher powers.* 3. What is meant by being *subject.*

1. Who are contained under this general expression of *every Soul*, πᾶσα ψυχὴ, which by an ordinary Hebraism, signifies every man. For man is a compounded Creature of Body and Soul, and either part of him is very often in Scripture put for the whole. Sometimes Flesh, and sometimes Soul signifies the man; and when *every Soul* is opposed to the *higher powers*, it must signifie all men, of what rank or condition soever they be, who are not invested with this higher power. *Popes* and *Bishops* and *Priests*, as well *Spiritual* as *Secular persons*; the whole Body of the People, as well as every single individual. For when *every Soul* is commanded to be subject, without any exception or limitation, this must reach them in all capacities and conditions.

The design of the Apostle, as you shall hear more presently, was to forbid all re-

reſiſtance of *Soveraign Princes*; and had he known of any men, or number of men, who might lawfully reſiſt, he ought not to have expreſt it in ſuch general terms, as to forbid all without exception. Had St. *Paul* known the Prerogative of St. *Peter*, and his Succeſſors the *Biſhops* of *Rome*, would he have written to the Chriſtians of *Rome* to be ſubject to their *Emperors*, without making any proviſion for the greater Authority of their *Biſhops*?

The reaſon he aſſigns why every Soul muſt be ſubject to the *higher Powers*, is, *becauſe all Powers are of God*. So that whoever is bound to be ſubject to God, muſt be ſubject to their *Prince*, who is in God's ſtead. And this I think will reach the *Pope of Rome*, as well as any private Chriſtian; unleſs he will pretend to more Authority on Earth, than God himſelf has: for the *Prince* has God's Authority, and therefore cannot be reſiſted, but by a greater Authority than God's. And by the ſame reaſon, if the whole body of the People be ſubject to God, they muſt be ſubject to their *Prince* too, becauſe he acts by God's Authority and Commiſſion. Were a Soveraign *Prince* the Peoples Creature, that

might be a good Maxim, *Rex major singulis, sed minor universis*, that the King is greater than any particular Subject, but less than All together; but if he be God's Minister, he is upon that account as much greater than all, as God is.

And that the whole Body of the People, all together, as well as one by one, are equally concerned in this Command of being subject to the *higher Powers*, is evident from this Consideration, That nothing less than this will secure the Peace and Tranquility of Humane Societies. The Resistance of single Persons is more dangerous to themselves than to the Prince, but a powerful Combination of Rebels is formidable to the most puissant Monarchs. The greater numbers of Subjects rebel against their Prince, the more do they distress his Government, and threaten his Crown and Dignity: and if his Person and Authority be Sacred, the greater the violence is, which is offered to him, the greater is the Crime.

Had the Apostle exhorted the *Romans* after this manner: Let no private and single man be so foolish, as to rebel against his *Prince*, who will be too strong for him: but if you can raise sufficient Forces

Forces to oppoſe againſt him, if you can all conſent to Depoſe or Murder him, this is very innocent and juſtifiable, nay an Heroical Atchievement; which becomes a free-born People: How would this ſecure the Peace and Quiet of the World? how would this have agreed with what follows, that *Princes* are advanced by God, and that to reſiſt our *Prince*, is to reſiſt the Ordinance of God, and that ſuch men ſhall be ſeverely puniſht for it in this World or the next? for can the Apoſtle be thought abſolutely to condemn Reſiſtance, if he makes it only unlawful to reſiſt when we want power to conquer? Which yet is all that can be made of it, if by every Soul the Apoſtle means only particular men, not the united Force and Power of Subjects.

Nor can there be any reaſon aſſigned, why the Apoſtle ſhould lay ſo ſtrict a command on particular Chriſtians to be ſubject to the higher Powers, which does not equally concern whole Nations. For if it can ever be lawful for a *whole Nation* to reſiſt a *Prince*, it may in the ſame Circumſtances be equally lawful for a particular man to do it: if a Nation may conſpire againſt a *Prince*, who invades

vades their Rights, their Liberties, or their Religion, why may not any man by the same reason resist a *Prince*, when his Rights and Liberties are invaded? It is not so safe and prudent indeed for a private man to resist, as for great and powerful numbers; but this makes resistance only a matter of discretion, not of Conscience: if it be lawful for the whole body of a Nation to resist in such cases, it must be equally lawful for a particular man to do it; but he does it at his own peril, when he has only his one single force to oppose against his *Prince*. So that our Apostle must forbid resistance in all or none. For single persons do not use to resist or rebel, or there is no great danger to the *Publick* if they do; but the Authority of *Princes*, and the security of publick Government, is only endangered by a Combination of *Rebels*, when the whole Nation or any considerable part for numbers, power, and interest, take Arms against their Prince. If resistance of our Prince be a sin, it is not the less, but the greater sin, the greater and the more formidable the resistance is; and it would very much unbecome the gravity and sacredness of an Apostolical Precept,

cept, to enjoyn Subjection to private Christians, who dare not, who cannot resist alone; but to leave a powerful combination of Rebels at liberty to resist. So that *every Soul* must signifie *all Subjects* whether single or united: for whatever is unlawful for every single Person considered as a Subject, is unlawful for them all together; for the whole Nation is as much a Subject to the *higher Powers*, as any single man. Thus I am sure it is in our Government, where *Lords* and *Commons* assembled in *Parliament* own themselves the Subjects of the *King*, and have by publick Laws disclaimed all Power of raising any *War* either *offensive* or *defensive against the King*.

2. Let us now consider what is meant by the higher Powers, [ἐξουσίαις ὑπερεχούσαις] which signifies the supreme Power in any Nation, in whomsoever it is placed. Whether in the *King*, as in *Monarchical Governments*; or in the *Nobles*, as in *Aristocratical*; or in the *People*, as in *Democracies*. At the time of writing this Epistle, the supreme Power was in the *Roman Emperors*; and therefore when St. *Paul* commands the *Roman* Christians to be subject to the *higher Powers*, the plain meaning is, that they should

be subject to the *Roman Emperour*. And thus St. *Peter* explains it, 1 *Epist.* 2. *Chap.* 13 *v.* Be subject to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether to the *King* as supreme, ὡς ὑπερέχοντι, the word used in my *Text*, as to him who hath a supereminent Power, and is above all others.

It is absolutely necessary in all well-governed Societies, that there should be some Supreme and Soveraign Power, from whence there lies no appeal, and which cannot and must not be resisted. For otherwise there can be no end of disputes, and controversies; men may quarrel eternally about Rights and Priviledges, and Properties, and Prehemminencies; and when every Man is Judge in his own cause, it is great odds but he will give Judgment for himself, and then there can be no way to determine such matters, but by force and power. Which turns human Societies into a state of War, and no man is secure any longer, than he happens to be on the prevailing side.

Whoever considers the nature and the end of Government, must acknowledge the necessity of a supreme power, to decide Controversies, to administer Justice,

and

and to ſecure the Publick Peace: and it is a ridiculous thing to talk of a ſupreme Power, which is not *unaccountable and irreſiſtible. For whatever* Power is liable to be called to an account, and to be reſiſted, has ſome power above it, and ſo is not ſupreme.

Of late years, whoever has been ſo hardy, as to aſſert the Doctrine of *Non-reſiſtance*, has been thought an Enemy to his Country, one who tramples on all Laws, who betrays the Rights and Liberties of the Subject, and ſets up for Tyranny an Arbitrary Power. Now I would deſire thoſe men, who think thus, to try their skill in framing any Model of Government, which ſhall anſwer the ends and neceſſities of human Society, without a ſupreme Power; that is, without ſuch a Power, as is abſolute and unaccountable.

If there be no ſupreme Power in any Society, when-ever there happens any difference among the Members of ſuch a Society, nothing can be done; and ſuch a Society is an arbitrary and voluntary, not a governed Society; becauſe there is no body to govern, and no body to be governed: they may govern themſelves by mutual conſent; but if they cannot

agree, there is an end of their Government.

Where there is any Government, there must be some-body to govern, and whoever has the Power of Government, must not be contradicted or resisted, for then he cannot govern; for a Power to govern men only when, and in what cases they please to be governed, is no Power. Now place this Power where you will, in a single Person, or in the hands of some select Persons, or in the People, and the case is the same; where-ever the Power rests, there it is absolute and unaccountable: where-ever there is any Government, there must be a last appeal, and where the last appeal is, whether to a *Prince*, to a *Parliament*, or to the *People*, there is soveraign and absolute power, which cannot be resisted without a dissolution of Government, and returning to a state of War; which is a direct contradiction to the first institution of human Societies, and therefore that which cannot be allowed by the fundamental Constitutions of any Society.

The result of all in short is this: 1. That in all civil governments, there must be some supreme and soveraign power. 2. That the very notion of

ſupreme power is, that it is unaccountable and irreſiſtible. And therefore, 3. Whatever power in any Nation according to the Fundamental Laws of its Government, cannot and ought not to be reſiſted, that is the ſupreme Power of that Nation, the higher powers to which the Apoſtle requires us to be ſubject. And from hence it is evident, that the *Crown of England is an Imperial Crown*, and has all the Rights of Soveraignty belonging to it. Since according to the fundamental Laws of the Realm, the *Perſon* and *Authority* of the *King* is ſacred and irreſiſtible. The *Oaths* of *Allegiance* and *Supremacy*, thoſe Laws which declare and acknowledge the *King* to be ſupreme in his Dominions under God, to have the ſole power of the Sword, that it is Treaſon to levy War againſt the *King* within the *Realm*, and without; That both, or either *Houſes* of *Parliament* cannot, nor lawfully may, *raiſe* or *levy war offenſive* or *defenſive* againſt his *Majeſty*, his *Heirs*, or *lawful Succeſſors*; That it is not lawful upon any pretence whatſoever to take Arms againſt the *King*, and that we muſt abhor that traiterous poſition of taking Arms by his Authority againſt his *Perſon*, or againſt thoſe

who are commissionated by him: These, I say, and such like declarations as these, both formerly and of late, made by both *Houses of Parliament*, and enacted into publick Laws, are a sufficient proof, that the Supreme Power of these Realms is lodged in the *Prince*. For he who is unaccountable and irresistible is supreme.

But to avoid all this, there are some who tell us, that by the higher Powers in the Text, the Apostle means the Law. For Laws are the highest and most venerable Authority in any Nation; and we ought indeed to be subject to *Princes* who themselves are subject to the Laws, which they are as much obliged to by virtue of this Apostolical Command as meaner Persons. For the law is as much superior to them, as they are to their own Subjects; and therefore when *Princes* violate publick Laws, they are no longer to own them for the *Higher Powers*, but may vindicate the Laws against them, may defend the legal Authority of their *Prince* against his personal Usurpations, may fight for the Authority of the *King* against his *Person*.

But in answer to this, we may consider, 1. That it is evident from the whole context and manner of speaking, that

that the Apoſtle does not here ſpeak of Laws, but Perſons; not of Imperial Laws, but Soveraign Princes. Laws were never before called the *Higher Powers*, neither in ſacred nor profane Writers; ἐξουσία in the New Teſtament always ſignifies the authority of a Perſon, not of a Law. And hence it ſignifies the Perſon inveſted with this Authority. It were eaſie to prove this by numerous inſtances; but it will be ſufficient to ſhew, that thus it muſt ſignifie in the Text. Theſe are ſuch Powers as are of God, appointed and ordained by God; which I ſuppoſe does not ſignifie the Laws of every Nation, many of which are far enough from being Divine. They are expreſly called Rulers in the 3 *v.* and are the object of fear; which can puniſh and reward: *If thou wilt not be afraid of the power,* ἐξουσία, *do that which is good, and thou ſhalt have praiſe of the ſame.* Now I think no Law, but the *Power*, which executes Laws, can apply puniſhments or rewards according to mens deſerts: and in the 4 *v.* this very Power is called the *Miniſter of God*, and ſaid to bear the Sword, which does not belong to Laws but Perſons; and in the Text, the Apoſtle ſpeaks of reſiſting

these Powers, opposing force to force. Now though Laws may be disobeyed, it is only Lawgivers and Rulers, who are capable of Resistance.

2. But however, these higher Powers may signifie Princes and Rulers, as governing according to known Laws. No, this cannot be neither, because the Apostle speaks of such powers as were under the Government of no Laws; as it is sufficiently known the *Roman Emperours* were not; their Will was their Law, and they made or repealed Laws at their pleasure. This Epistle was wrote either under *Claudius* or *Nero*; and I think I need not tell you, that neither of those *Emperours* had any great Reverence for Laws, and yet these were the higher Powers to whom the Apostle commands them to be subject: and indeed, though there be a vast difference between a *Prince*, who by the fundamental Constitutions of his Kingdom, ought to govern by Laws, and a *Prince* whose Will is his Law; yet no Law can come into the notion and definition of supreme and soveraign Power: such a Prince is under the direction, but cannot properly be said to be under the government of the Law, because there

is

is no ſuperior power to take cognizance of his breach of it; and a Law has no Authority to govern, where there is no Power to punish. But I ſhall have occaſion to diſcourſe this more largely hereafter.

3. Let us now conſider, what is meant by being ſubject. Now Subjection, according to its full latitude of ſignification, includes all thoſe Duties, which we owe to Soveraign Princes; a chearful and willing obedience to all their juſt and lawful Commands; an humble ſubmiſſion to their reproofs and cenſures, corrections and puniſhments; to honour and reverence their Perſons and Authority; to pay cuſtom and tribute, and all legal taxes and impoſitions, as our Apoſtle adds, verſe the 7. *Render therefore unto all their dues, tribute to whom tribute is due, cuſtom to whom cuſtom, fear to whom fear, honour to whom honour.* But the principal thing he has regard to in the Text, is *Non-reſiſtance*, which is the only perfect and abſolute ſubjection we owe to Princes. We are not always bound to do what they command, becauſe they may command, what we ought not, what we muſt not do; but we are always bound

to be subject, that is, never to resist. Though a *Prince* abuse his Power, and oppress his Subjects, we must not take upon us to right ourselves, but must leave our Cause to God, who is the great Protector of oppress Innocence: for as the Apostle tells us, He *that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist*, &c. This is the Doctrine the Apostle teaches, that *we must be subject to*; that is, that we must not resist, nor rebel against *Soveraign Princes*.

2. Let us then now consider the reason, whereby the Apostle proves and inforces this Doctrine of *Subjection* or *Non-Resistance*. *For there is no power but of God; the powers that be, are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God.* The plain meaning of which is this: That *Soverqign Princes* are advanced to the Throne by God, and are his Ministers and Vicegerents, invested with his Authority and Power to govern; and therefore when we resist our *Prince*, we resist the ordinance, constitution, and appointment of God. Such men do not resist, rebel, or fight against man, but God. As he who resists any subordinate

ordinate Magistrates, resists his Prince, from whom they receive their Authority and Commission. And this is a very forcible Argument to *Subjection* to *Princes*: for whatever our *Prince* be, it is certain, that God has an absolute and uncontroulable Right over us, as being the natural Lord and Governour of the World; and if earthly *Princes* are plac'd in the Throne by him, who is at liberty to put the Government of the World into what hands he pleases, who will dare to oppose God? or ask him, Why hast thou done so? Whoever has any sense of God's dominion and soveraignty, dares not rebel against him; and he, who believes that *Princes* are made by God, will no more dare to rebel against his *Prince*, than against God himself.

The *Patrons* of *Resistance* have used all manner of Arts to evade the force of this *Text*, and to make the *Apostles* argument signifie just nothing; and therefore it will be necessary to consider briefly what they say.

1. Then some of them own the truth of what St. *Paul* asserts, that *Soveraign Princes* are of God, are advanc'd and let in their Thrones by him; but then they say, *Princes* are from God, no otherwise

Milton pro Pop. Angl. Defensio. p. 68.

wise than every thing else is of God. The Divine Providence governs all things; and Plague and Pestilence and Famine, and whatever evil and calamity befals a Nation, is from God too; but does it hence follow, that when God brings any of these Judgments upon us, we must not endeavour to remove them? No more, say they, does it follow, that we must not endeavour to break the Yoak of a *Tyrant*, because it was put on by God. That is, in plain English, that when the *Apostle* proves, that we must not resist *Princes*, because they are set up by God, he does not reason truly; for notwithstanding this, we may resist *Tyrannical Princes*, as we would do the *Plague*, though they are both sent by God: and I suppose these men believe that St. *Paul* was no more inspired by God, than *Princes* are made by him. Otherwise they might as easily have concluded, that since St. *Paul* founds no Doctrine of *Non-resistance* upon God's authority and dominion in advancing *Princes*, (and his argument must be good, if he were an inspired man) that therefore there is some little difference between God's making a *King*, though a *Tyrant*, and his

his ſending the Plague: and any man of an ordinary underſtanding might gueſs, that when *God* ſets up a *King*, with a ſoveraign Power, he ſets him up to govern; and therefore though he may prove a ſcourge and a plague, yet he is ſuch a Plague, as God will allow no man to remove, but himſelf. For it is a contradiction in the nature of the thing, to give authority to a *Prince* to govern, and to leave Subjects at liberty to reſiſt. *Tyrants* are God's Miniſters, though they be but Executioners of his juſt vengeance; but an Executioner, though he be as dangerous as the Plague, cannot be reſiſted, without reſiſting the *Prince*.

2. At other times they tell us, that when St. *Paul* aſſerts, that *there is no power but of God, the powers that be, are ordained of God*; he means this only of the Inſtitution of Civil Power and Government, not of every *Prince* that is advanced to this Power. The inſtitution of Civil Government they will allow to be from God, but they think it a reproach to God to own that Tyrants and Oppreſſors, wicked and impious Kings, are advanced by God. His Providence many times, for wiſe Reaſons, permits

permits this, as he does all other evils; but they cannot believe, that such men are advanc'd by his counsel and approbation, and positive will and appointment. But this admits of various Answers. For,

1. Can there be no wise Reason given, why God may advance a bad Man to be a *Prince*? If there may, then it is no reproach to the Divine Providence. The natural end of human Societies is the preservation of Publick Peace and Order; and this is in some measure attained even under the Government of *Tyrants*. But God has a further end than this, to bless and reward a virtuous Nation, or to punish a loose and degenerate Age; and there cannot be a greater Blessing than a wise and virtuous *Prince*, nor a greater Plague than a merciless *Tyrant*: And therefore the Providence of God is as much concerned in setting a good or a bad *Prince* over any People, as in rewarding or punishing them. Upon this account, God calls the *King* of *Assyria*, *the rod of his anger, whom he raised up for the punishment of an Hypocritical Nation*, 10 Isai. 5, 6.

2. I have already proved, that by the

the *Powers* in my *Text*, the *Apoſtle* means the Perſons of *Soveraign Princes*; and therefore according to his Doctrine, thoſe *Princes* who were then in being, that is, the *Roman Emperours*, were advanc'd by God; *the powers that be*, that is, the Princes and Emperors who now govern the World, are ordained and appointed by God. And that thus it is, God himſelf tells us, 27 Jerem. 5, 6. *I have made the Earth, and given it unto whom it ſeemed meet unto me: and now I have given all theſe Lands into the hands of Nebuchadnezzar King of Babylon my Servant.* Thus he called *Cyrus* by name, many years before he was born, *to be his ſhepherd, and to perform his pleaſure in rebuilding Jeruſalem*, 44 Iſa. 28. 45. ch. 1, 2, 3, 4.

This was the belief of the primitive Chriſtians under heathen and perſecuting *Emperors*. *Tertullian* who wrote his *Apology* under *Severus*, aſſerts that *Cæſar* was choſen by God, and therefore that the Chriſtians had a peculiar *Propriety* in *Cæſar*, as being made *Emperor* by their God. *Sed quid ego amplius de religione atque Pietate Chriſtiana in Imperatorem, quem neceſſe eſt ſuſpiciamus, ut eum quem Dominus noſter elegit, & merito*

rito dixerim, noster est magis Cæsar, à Deo nostro constitutus. Tert. Apol. cap. 33. and this he assigns as the reason, why they honour and reverence, and pray for him, and are in all things subject to him.

3. If these Men will grant, the institution of Civil Power and Authority by God, is a necessary reason why we must not resist those who have this Power, it shall satisfie me; and I will dispute no further, whether by *Powers* in the *Text* the *Apostle* means Civil Government, or the Persons of *Princes*, so long as the Doctrine of *Non-resistance* is secured: but if they will not grant this, then they must grant, that either the *Apostle* reasons weakly, or that this is not the sense of his words.

St. *Chrysostom* indeed by the *Powers* that be ordained of God, understands no more than that Civil Power and Authority is from God, as being afraid to own that all Princes, though never so wicked are appointed by God; but then he owns the Doctrine of *Non-resistance*, because the Power is from God, whoever have the possession of it, or however he came by it. But I think the argument for *Non-resistance* is much stronger,

ſtronger, if we acknowledge, that *Sovereign Princes* themſelves are appointed by God, and have this Power put into their hands by his peculiar and ordering Providence.

4. Others in plain terms deny, that this is true, that Princes receive their Power from God, and are ordained and appointed by him, though the words of the Apoſtle are very plain and expreſs in the caſe.

But let us ſet aſide the Authority of the *Apoſtle* a-while, and examine why they ſay ſo. And this they think is very plain in all Nations, that *Princes* are advanc'd to the Throne by the choice and conſent of the *People*, or by *Right* of *Inheritance*, confirmed and ſetled by *Publick Laws*, which include the conſent of the *People*, and therefore they receive their Power from thoſe who choſe them; which is no more than a *Fiduciary Power*, which they are liable to give an account of to thoſe who chooſe them.

Now grant this to be true, that *Princes* are advanc'd to the Throne by the *People*, which will not very well hold in *Conqueſts*, nor in *hereditary Kingdoms*; yet, I ſay, ſuppoſe it to be true,

ſince

since it was manifestly the case of the *Roman Empire*, when the Apostle wrote this Epistle, their *Emperors* being chosen either by the *Senate* or the *Army*; yet I would desire to be resolved in some few plain questions.

1. Whether God does nothing, but what he does by an immediate power? Whether he cannot appoint and choose an *Emperor*, unless he does it by a *Voice* from Heaven, or sends an *Angel* to set the Crown upon his head? Whether God cannot by a great many unknown ways, determine the choice of the People, to that Person, whom he has before chosen himself? May we not as well say, that God does nothing but Miracles, because every thing else has some visible cause, and may be ascribed either to natural or moral Agents? God may chuse an *Emperor*, and the People chuse him too, and the Peoples choice is only the effect of *God's* choice; and therefore notwithstanding all this, *Princes* owe their Crowns and Scepters to *God*: *the Powers that be are ordained of God.*

2. How does it follow, that because Princes are chose by the People, therefore they derive their Power from them, and are accountable to them? This is not

not true in humane Governments. A City or any Corporation may have Authority to chooſe their Magiſtrates, and yet they do not derive their Power from their fellow-Citizens, who choſe them, but from their Prince. Thus the People may chuſe, but God inveſts with Power and Authority. For indeed, how can People, who have no Power of Government themſelves, give that Power, which they have not? God is the only Governour of the world, and therefore there can be no Power of Government, but what is derived from him. But theſe men think, that all civil authority is founded in conſent; as if there were no natural Lord of the World, or all Mankind came free and independent into the World. This is a contradiction to what at other times they will grant, that the inſtitution of Civil Power and Authority is from God; and indeed if it be not, I know not how any Prince can juſtifie the taking away the life of any Man, whatever crime he has been guilty of. For no Man has Power of his own life, and therefore cannot give this Power to another: which proves that the Power of capital puniſhments cannot reſult from meer conſent, but from a

Superiour Authority, which is Lord of Life and Death.

If it be said, That every man has a natural Right to defend his own Life by taking away the Life of any man who injuriously Assaults him, and he may part with his Power of Self-defence to his *Prince*, and that includes the Power of Life and Death: I Answer,

1. Suppose the Laws of *Self-preservation* will justifie the taking away another man's Life in Preservation of our own, yet this is a *Personal Right*, which *God* and *Nature* has given us; and unless we can prove, that we have Authority to make over this *Right* to another, as well as to use it our selves, our Consent cannot give Authority to the Magistrate to take away any man's Life in our Cause.

2. This natural Right of Self-defence cannot be the Original of the Magistrates Power, because no man does give up this right. Every man has the right of *Self-preservation*, as intire under civil Government, as he had in a state of Nature. Under what Government soever I live, I may still kill another man, when I have no other way to preserve my own Life from unjust violence by private

hands. And this is all the Liberty any man had in a supposed state of Nature. So that the Magistrates Power of the Sword is a very different thing from every man's Right of Self-preservation, and cannot owe its original to it. For,

3. The Magistrates Power of the Sword is not meerly *defensive*, as the right of Self-preservation is, but *vindicative*, to execute Vengeance on Evil-doers; which Power no man has over his Equals in a state of Nature. For vengeance is an act of Superiority, and supposes the Authority of a Lord and Judge; and therefore the Consent of all Mankind cannot give the Power and Authority of a Sword to a *Prince*, because they never had it themselves. A *Prince*, as he bears the Sword, is not the Peoples Officer, but the Minister of God, a Revenger to execute wrath upon him that doth Evil, as our Apostle adds, *v.* 4. and this is the true Reason of our Subjection. *Wherefore you must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake.*

4. There is another Objection against what the Apostle affirms, that *there is no Power but of God: the Powers that be, are ordained of God.* For is the Power of victorious Rebels and Usurpers from

God? Did *Oliver Cromwell* receive his Power from God? then it seems, it was unlawful to resist him too, or to conspire against him: then all those Loyal Subjects, who refused to submit to him, when he had got the Power in his hands, were Rebels and Traitors.

To this I answer, that the most prosperous Rebel is not the *Higher Powers*, while our *natural Prince*, to whom we owe obedience and subjection, is in being. And therefore though such Men may get the Power into their hands by Gods permission, yet not by God's Ordinance; and he who resists them, does not resist the Ordinance of God, but the Usurpations of Men. In *Hereditary Kingdoms*, the *King* never dies, but the same minute that the natural Person of one *King* dies, the Crown descends upon the next of Blood; and therefore he who rebelleth against the Father, and murders him, continues a Rebel in the Reign of the Son, which commences with his Father's death.

It is otherwise indeed, where none can pretend a greater Right to the Crown, than the Usurper; for there possession of Power seems to give a Right. Thus many of the *Roman Emperours* came to

the

the Crown by very ill means, but when they were poſſeſt of it, they were the *Higher Powers*; for the Crown did not deſcend by *Inheritance*, but ſometimes by the *Election* of the *Senate*, ſometimes of the *Army*, and ſometimes by *Force* and *Power*, which always draws a conſent after it. And therefore the *Apoſtle* does not direct the Chriſtians to enquire by what Title the Emperours held their Crowns, but commands them to ſubmit to thoſe, who had the Power in their hands: for the poſſeſſion of Supreme and Soveraign Power is *Title* enough, when there is no better *Title* to oppoſe againſt it. For then we muſt preſume, that God gives him the irreſiſtible authority of a King, to whom he gives an irreſiſtible Power; which is the only means, whereby *Monarchies* and *Empires* are transferred from one Nation to another. There are two Examples in Scripture which manifeſtly confirm what I have now ſaid.

The firſt in the Kingdom of *Iſrael*: after the ten Tribes had divided from the Houſe of *Judah*, and the Family of *David*, God had not entailed the Kingdom upon any certain Family; he had indeed by *Ahijah* the Prophet promiſed

after *Solomons* death ten Tribes to *Jeroboam* the Son of *Nebat*, 1 *Kings* 11. 29. &c. but had afterwards by the same Prophet threatned *Jeroboam*, to destroy his whole Family, *Chap.* 15. 10, 11. *Baasha* fulfils this Prophecy by the traiterous murder of *Nadab*, (who succeeded his Father *Jeroboam* in the Kingdom) and usurpt the Government himself, and slew all *Jeroboam's house*, 28, 29. *v.* This Murder and Treason is numbred among the sins of *Baasha*; for which God afterwards threatned to destroy his house, as he had done the house of *Jeroboam*, 16 *Chap. v.* 7. and yet he having usurpt the Throne, and got the Power into his hands, and no man having a better Title than his, God himself is said to have exalted him out of the dust, and made him *Prince* over his *People Israel*, *v.* 2. *Elah* succeeded *Baasha*, who had no better Title than his Father; and yet *Zimri*, who slew him, is accused of Treason for it, *v.* 20. *Zimri* usurpt the Kingdom when he had slew his Master, but he was only a vain Pretender to it, when he wanted Power; for when the People who were encamped against *Gibbethon*, heard that *Zimri* had killed the King, they made *Omri* King, and went immediately

diately and besieged *Tirzah*, where *Zimri* had taken possession of the Kings Palace; who finding no way to escape, set fire to it himself, and died in the flames of it. And now *Israel* was divided between *Omri* and *Tibni*; but those who followed *Omri* prevailed against those who followed *Tibni*; and *Tibni* died, and *Omri* reigned, *v.* 21, 22. All which plainly shews, that where there is no regular Succession to the Kingdom, there possession of Power makes a King, who cannot afterwards be resisted and opposed without the guilt of Treason: and this was the case of the *Roman Empire*, at the writing of this Epistle; and therefore the Apostle might well say, *That the Powers that be, are ordained of God.* That whoever had the Supream Power in his hands, is the higher Power, that must not be resisted.

But it was otherwise in the Kingdom of *Judah*, which God himself had entailed on *David*'s Family, as appears from the Example of *Joash*, who was concealed by his *Aunt Jehosheba*, and hid in the House of the Lord for six years. During this time *Athaliah* reigned, and had the whole Power of Government in her hands; but yet this did not make

her a Soveraign and irresistible Prince; becauſe *Joaſh* the Son of *Ahaziah*, the right Heir of the Crown, was yet alive. And therefore in the ſeventh year *Jehoiada* the Prieſt ſet *Joaſh* upon the Throne, and ſlew *Athaliah*, and was guilty of no Treaſon or Rebellion in doing ſo, 2 *Kings* 11. Which ſhews, that no Uſurpations can extinguiſh the Right and Title of a natural *Prince*. Such Uſurpers, though they have the poſſeſſion of the Supream Power, yet they have no right to it; and though God for wiſe reaſons may ſometimes permit ſuch Uſurpations, yet while his Providence ſecures the Perſons of ſuch depoſed and baniſhed Princes from violence, he ſecures their Title too. As it was in *Nebuchadnezzar*'s viſion: *The tree is cut down, but the ſtump of the roots is left in the earth. The Kingdom ſhall be ſure to them, after that they ſhall know that the Heavens do rule*, Dan. 4. 26.

3. The Apoſtle adds, the puniſhment of thoſe, who reſiſt the *higher Powers*: *They that reſiſt ſhall receive to themſelves damnation*. Where, by κρίμα judgment and damnation, it is plain the Apoſtle means the puniſhments of the other World. Proſperous Rebellions are not always puniſht in this world, but they are in the next,

next. And therefore we must be subject not only for wrath, for fear of men; but out of conscience towards God, and a reverence of his righteous Judgments.

The sum of all in short is this: That all Men, whatever their rank and condition be; not only secular, but spiritual Persons; not only private Men, but subordinate Magistrates; not only single Men, but whole Bodies and Communities, the united force and power of a Nation, must be subject to *Soveraign Princes*; that is, must obey all their just and lawful Commands, and patiently submit even to their unjust violence, without making any resistance, without opposing force to force, or taking Arms, though it be only in their own defence. For *Soveraign Princes* are made and advanced by God, who exerciseth a particular Providence in the disposal of Crowns and Scepters, and over-ruleth all external and second causes, to set up such *Princes* as he himself has first chose; and therefore he that resisteth, resisteth not Man, but God; he opposeth the constitution and appointment of the Soveraign Lord of the World, who alone is our natural Lord and Governour, and

who

who alone has right to put the Government of the World into what hands he pleases; and how prosperous soever such Rebels may be in this World, they shall not escape the Divine Vengeance and Justice, which will follow them into another world: *they shall receive to themselves Damnation.*

This was St. *Paul*'s Doctrine about subjection to the *higher Powers*; and he did not only preach this Doctrine himself, but he charges *Timothy* and *Titus*, two Bishops whom he had ordained, the one *Bishop* of *Ephesus*, the other of *Crete*, to preach the same.

Thus he charges *Titus*, to *put them in mind to be subject to Principalities and Powers, to obey Magistrates, to be ready to every good work*, 3 *Titus* 1. When he commands him to put them in mind to be subject, he supposes, that this is a known Duty of the Christian Religion, and a Duty of such great weight and moment, that People ought to be frequently minded of it; that the Bishops and Ministers of Religion ought frequently to preach of it, and to press and inculcate it upon their hearers. For it is a great scandal to the Christian Religion, when this duty is not observed: and yet

in

in many Cases this Duty is so hard to be observed, and requires such a great degree of Self-denial and Resignation to the Will of God, and contempt of present Things, that too many men are apt to forget it, and to excuse themselves from it. And therefore St. *Paul* gives this in particular charge to *Titus*, and in him to all the Bishops and Ministers of the Gospel, to take special care to instruct People well in this Point, and frequently to renew and repeat their Exhortations; especially when they find a busie, factious, and seditious Spirit abroad in the World.

Thus he instructs *Timothy* the *Bishop* of *Ephesus*, 1 *Tim.* 2. 1. *I exhort therefore, that first of all, Supplications, Prayers, Intercessions, and giving of Thanks, be made for all men; for Kings, and for all that are in Authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable Life, in all Godliness and honesty.*

But you will say, What is this to such an absolute Subjection to Princes as includes *Non-resistance* in it? cannot we pray for any man, without making him our absolute and Soveraign Lord? are we not bound to pray for all our Enemies and Persecutors? and does our praying for them, make it unlawful to resist and oppose

oppose their unjust violence? How then can you prove from the duty of praying for Kings, that it is in no case lawful to resist them? if it were lawful to resist *Tyrannical Princes*, yet it might be our duty to pray for them. And therefore though it be our duty to pray for *Princes*, it does not hence follow, that we may in no cases lawfully resist them.

In answer to this, I grant, that praying for any man, nay praying for *Kings* and *Princes* cannot of itself prove, that it is unlawful to resist them, if it otherwise appear, that resistance is lawful; but if it be our duty to make supplications, prayers, and intercessions for persecuting *Princes*, as the Apostle commands them to pray for the *Roman Emperours*, who were profest Enemies to Christianity; that is, if they must beg all good things for them, a long and happy and prosperous Reign, which is included in intercessions and prayers; this strongly infers, that they must not resist their Power, nor undermine their Thrones. For we cannot very well at the same time pray for the prosperity of their Government, and endeavour to pull it down. The Apostle did not understand those conditional Prayers, that God would *convert*

vert or *confound* them; a *Prayer*, which thanks be to God, was never found in any Christian *Liturgy* yet; which possibly is one reason, why some Men are no great Friends to *Liturgies*. And when the Apostle directs them to *pray for Kings and all that are in authority, that they must live quiet and peaceable lives in all godlineſs and honeſty*; that is, that they might enjoy peace and security in the profession and practice of the true Religion; this seems to imply, that when they are persecuted for their Religion, which was the case at that time, they must pray for persecuting Princes, that God would incline their hearts to favour his people; but must not fight against them. This is the only direction the Apostle gives them in the case; and we may reasonably suppose, that had he known any other, he would not have concealed it. If it is always the duty of Christians to pray for the prosperous and flourishing state of the *Empire*, as by this Apostolical Exhortation it appears to be, it could never be lawful for them to resist the Powers: for I cannot understand how any man without mocking Almighty God, can pray for the prosperity of his Prince, and the good

ſucceſs of his Government, at the ſame time, when he fights againſt him. When St. *Paul* had ſo freely and openly declared againſt reſiſting the Higher Powers, which *Timothy*, who was his Scholar and Companion, and Fellow-labourer, could not but know; what other interpretation could he make of the Apoſtles Exhortation, to pray for Kings, and all that are in Authority, that we may live quiet and peaceable lives in all godlineſs and honeſty, but only this, that Prayer is the laſt and only remedy that we can have againſt perſecuting *Princes*? Had it been lawful for them to reſiſt, it had been a more proper Prayer, that God would give them ſtrength and courage and counſel to oppoſe all his and their Enemies: that he would appear as miraculouſly for their Defence, as he formerly did in fighting the *Battels* of *Iſrael*; that he would ſet Chriſt upon his Throne, and make all the *Princes* of the Earth give place to a more glorious Kingdom. Time was, when it was all one, whether he ſaved with many or a few. He knew how to deſtroy Potent and Formidable Armies, without any Human Strength and Power, or by ſuch weak and contemptible Means, as reſerved

ved the Glory of the Victory intire to himself: and he is the same still that ever he was, and his Power is the same. But St. *Paul* very well knew, that it was not lawful for them to pull Emperours out of their Thrones, to give any disturbance to Civil Powers, or to Attempt any Changes or Innovations in Government; and therefore since they must submit to such Princes as they had, there was no other remedy left them, but to beg of God so to incline the hearts of Princes, that they might enjoy a quiet and peaceable possession of their Religion, even under Pagan Princes. For as much as some men of late days profanely scoff at Prayers and Tears, these have been always thought the only remedy the Church has against persecuting Powers; and it seems St. *Paul* thought so too, for he prescribes no other; and yet he does not allow them to pray against the King neither, but exhorts them to pray for him, and that they might enjoy Peace and Security under his Government.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

St. Peter's *Doctrine about Non-Resistance.*

HAving heard what St. *Paul*'s Doctrine was, let us now consider what St. *Peter* taught about this matter: he had as much reason to learn this Lesson as any of the Apostles, our Saviour having severely rebuked him for drawing his Sword against the lawful Powers, as you have already heard. And indeed, his rash and intemperate zeal in this action cost him very dear; for we have reason to believe, that this was the chief thing, that tempted him to deny his *Master*. He was afraid to own himself to be his Disciple, or that he had been in the Garden with him; because he was conscious to himself, that by drawing his sword, and smiting the Servant of the High Priest, he had incurred the penalty of the Law, and had he been discovered, could expect nothing less, but to be severely punish'd for it, it may be to have lost his life for his

his reſiſtance. And indeed, this has very often been the fate of thoſe men, who have been tranſported with a boiſtrous and intemperate zeal to draw their Swords for their Maſter and his Religion againſt the lawful Powers, that they commonly deny their Maſter, and deſpiſe his Religion, before they put their Swords up again.

But St. *Peter* having by our Saviour's Reproof, and his own dear-bought experience learn't the evil of Reſiſtance, never drew his Sword more, and took great care to inſtruct Chriſtians not to do ſo, 1 Peter 2. 13, 14, 15, 16. *Submit your ſelves to every Ordinance of man for the Lord's ſake, whether it be to the King as ſupreme; or unto Governours, as to them that are ſent by him, for the puniſhment of evil doers, and for the praiſe of them that do well. For ſo is the will of God, that with well-doing, ye may put to ſilence the ignorance of fooliſh men. As free, and not uſing your liberty as a cloak of maliciouſneſs, but as the Servants of God.*

This is the very ſame Doctrine which St. *Paul* taught the *Romans*: *Let every ſoul be ſubject to the higher Powers*; for the ſame word is uſed in the

original ὑποτάσσεσθαι and ὑποτάσσεσθαι, and therefore to submit and to be subject is the same thing, which, as St. *Paul* tells us, signifies *Non-resistance*. Only as St. *Paul* speaks only of not resisting the *Higher Powers*; that is, Emperours and Soveraign Princes, herein including all those, who act by their Authority; St. *Peter*, to prevent all Cavils and Exceptions, distinctly mentions both, that we must submit to all human Power and Authority, not only to the *King as Supreme*, that is, in St. *Paul's* phrase, to the *Higher Powers*, to all *Soveraign Princes* who are invested with the Supreme Authority; but also to those, who *are sent by him*, who receive their Authority and Commission from the *Soveraign Prince*.

St. *Paul* tells us at large, that *all power is of God*, and that the Power is the *minister of God*, and *he that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God*; and *therefore we must needs be subject, not only for wrath*; that is, for fear of being punish'd by men, *but also for Conscience sake*, out of reverence to God, and fear of his Judgment. This St. *Peter* comprises in one word, which includes it all: Submit your selves to every ordinance of man *for the Lord's sake*: for how

how is God concered in our obedience to Princes, if they be not his Miniſters, who are appointed and advanced by him, and act by his Authority, and if it be not his will and command, that we ſhould obey them? and therefore he adds, for *this is the will of God, that with well doing*, that is, by obedience and ſubjection to Princes, *ye may put to ſilence the ignorance of fooliſh men*, that is, that you may put to ſilence thoſe fooliſh men, who ignorantly accuſe you, as fond of changes, and troubleſome and dangerous to Government. But then St. *Peter* obſerving, that Chriſtian Liberty was made a pretence for Seditions and Treaſons, he cautions them againſt that alſo, *As free, but not uſing your liberty for a cloak of maliciouſneſs*, that is, to cover and excuſe ſuch wickedneſs as Rebellion againſt Princes, *but as the ſervants of God:* You muſt remember, whatever freedom Chriſt has purchas'd for you, he has not delivered you from obedience and ſubjection to God; you are his ſervants ſtill, and therefore muſt be ſubject to thoſe, who receive their power and authority from God, as all Soveraign Princes do.

This is as plain, one would think, as

words can make it; but nothing can be so plain, but that men who are unwilling to understand it, and who set their wits on work to avoid the force and evidence of it, may be able to find something to say, to deceive themselves, and those who are willing to be deceived: and therefore it will be necessary to consider, what false colours some men have put upon these words, to elude and baffle the plain scope and design of the Apostle in them.

As first, they observe, that St. *Peter* calls *Kings* and subordinate Governours an ordinance of man, or a human Creature, ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις and from hence they conclude that *Kings* are only the *Peoples Creatures*; they are made by the *People*, and receive their Power from them, and therefore are accountable to them if they abuse their Power. In answer to this, we may consider,

1. That this interpretation of St. *Peter*'s words, is a direct contradiction to St. *Paul*, who expresly asserts, that there is no Power but of God, the Powers that be are ordained of God: but according to this exposition of *humane Creature*, or the *Ordinance of Man*, there is no Power of God, but all Power is derived from the

the *People.* Kings and Princes may be choſen by men, as it is in *Elective Kingdoms*, and as it was at that time in the *Roman Empire*; but they receive their Power from God, and thus St. *Paul* and St. *Peter* may be reconciled: but to affirm, that St. *Peter* calls Kings an Ordinance of man, becauſe they receive their Power and Authority from men, is an irreconcilable contradiction to St. *Paul*, who affirms, that they receive their Power from God, that they are God's and not the Peoples Miniſters. Now though St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* did once differ upon a matter of Prudence, it would be of ill conſequence to Religion, to make them differ in ſo material a Doctrine as this is: and yet there is no way to reconcile them, but by expounding St. *Peter's* words ſo as to agree with St. *Paul's*; for St. *Paul's* words can never be reconciled with that ſenſe, which theſe men give of St. *Peter's*; and that is a good Argument to me, that is not the true interpretation of St. *Peter*; for I verily believe, that theſe two great Apoſtles did not differ in this Point.

2. St. *Peter* exhorts them to *ſubmit to every ordinance of man for the Lord's*

sake; which plainly signifies, that whatever hand men may have in modelling Civil Governments, yet it is the Ordinance of God, and Princes receive their Power from him. For it is no act of disobedience to God to resist our Prince, nor of obedience to God to submit to him, if he does not derive his Power from God, and act by his Authority and commission; especially in such cases, when he opposes the Government of God, and the Interest of Religion; and oppresses not only God's Creatures, but his most faithful and obedient People, who are his peculiar care and charge: in such cases as these, if Princes do not receive their Power from God, they are opposite and rival Powers, and we can no more submit to them for God's sake, than we can submit to a Rebel for the sake of, that is, out of Duty and Loyalty to our *natural Prince*. And therefore when the Apostle exhorts them, for God's sake to submit to their King, he plainly supposes, what St. *Paul* did particularly express, that Kings receive their Power from God, and therefore are God's Ministers, even when they abuse their Power; and he that resists, resists the Ordinance and Authority of God.

3. But

3. But ſuppoſe we ſhould grant, that when St. *Peter* calls Kings the Ordinance of Man, he means, that they receive their Power and Authority from Men; yet I cannot ſee, what good this will do them: for he plainly diſowns their conſequence, that therefore Princes are accountable to the People, as to their Superiors, and may be reſiſted, depoſed, and brought to condign puniſhment, if they abuſe this Power; as will appear from theſe two Obſervations. 1. That he gives the King the Title of Supreme, ὑπερέχοντι, who is above them all, and is inveſted with the Supreme and Soveraign Power. Now the Supreme Power in the very Notion of it, is irreſiſtible and unaccountable; for otherwiſe it is not Supreme, but ſubject to ſome Superiour Juriſdiction; which it is evidently known the *Roman* Emperours, of whom the Apoſtle here ſpeaks, were not. And 2. That he requires ſubjection to this humane Ordinance, which, as appears from St. *Paul*, ſignifies *Non-reſiſtance*. So that though we ſhould grant, that the King derives his Power from the People, yet it ſeems, God confirms and eſtabliſhes the Crown on his Head, and will not ſuffer People to take it off again, when they pleaſe.

4. But after all, there is no colour for this Objection from the Apostles words: for this ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις humane order or ordination, signifies nothing but humane Authority, such Power and Authority as is exercised by men for the good government of humane Societies. And the meaning is only this; that out of reverence and obedience to God, from whom all Power is derived, they should submit to that Authority, which is exercised by men, whether to the Supreme Power of *Soveraign Princes*, or that Subordinate Authority which he bestows on *inferiour Magistrates*.

2. It is farther objected, that though St. *Peter* does command Christians to submit to Kings and Governours, yet it is with a limitation, as far as they govern well, while they exercise their Authority in pursuance of the great ends of its institution; *for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well.* And here St. *Peter* agrees very well with St. *Paul*, who assigns this as the reason, why they may be subject to the Powers: For *Rulers are not a terrour to good works, but to the evil; wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise*

praiſe of the ſame. For he is the miniſter of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil be afraid, for he beareth not the ſword in vain: for he is the miniſter of God, an avenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil, 13 *Rom.* 3, 4. Now we cannot be bound to obey and ſubmit, any farther than the reaſon of our obedience reaches: and if the reaſon why we muſt obey Princes, is, becauſe they puniſh wickedneſs, and reward and encourage Vertue, which is ſo great a bleſſing to humane Societies, then we are not bound to obey them, when they do quite contrary; when they encourage Vice, and oppreſs the moſt exemplary innocence. Now in anſwer to this, let us conſider,

1. Whether theſe great Apoſtles intended to oblige the Chriſtians of that Age to yield obedience to thoſe Powers, which then governed the World. If they did, (as I think no man will be ſo hardy as to ſay, that they did not) then it will be proper to enquire, whether what they here affirm, and aſſign as the reaſon of their ſubjection, that *Rulers* are not a terrour to good works, but to the evil, were true of the *Roman Emperours* and Governours, or not. If it were

were true, then I believe it will hold true of all *Kings*, in all Ages of the world; for there cannot well be greater *Tyrants* than the *Roman Emperors* were at this time: and so this will prove an eternal reason, why we should be subject to *Princes*, notwithstanding the many faults and miscarriages of their Government. If it were not true, it is very strange, that two such great *Apostles*, should use such an argument to perswade Christians to submit to the Powers, as only proved the quite contrary, that they ought not to be subject to the present Powers, because they were unjust and tyrannical, and in contradiction to the original design and institution of Civil Power, were a terrour to good works and not to the evil.

The *Christians* were at that time persecuted by *Jews* and *Heathens*, by all the Powers of the World. The Apostle exhorts them not to resist the Powers, because they were not a terror to good works, but to the evil. If by this he only means, that they should be subject to them, while they encouraged Vertue, and vertuous Men, but might rebel against them, when they did the contrary; how could the *Christians* of those days

days think themſelves obliged by this to ſubmit to the Higher Powers?

For this was not their caſe. They ſuffered for righteouſneſs ſake; the Powers were a terrour to them, though they were innocent, though they could not charge them, either with breaking the Laws of God or Men; and therefore they were not bound to ſubmit to them, whenever they could find it ſafe to reſiſt. So that either theſe men put a falſe comment upon the Text, or while the *Apoſtle* undertakes to deter them from Reſiſtance, he urges ſuch an argument as was proper only to perſwade them to rebel.

2. We may alſo conſider, that this interpretation of the words makes the Apoſtles argument childiſh and ludicrous, and wholly uſeleſs to perſwade any man to be ſubject, who needs perſwaſion. For I take it for granted, that there is no need to perſwade any Man, eſpecially the good and vertuous, not to reſiſt the Powers, when he meets with the juſt rewards and encouragements of Vertue. The uſual pretence for Seditions and Treaſons, is to redreſs publick Grievances, to deliver themſelves from a ſtate of oppreſſion and ſlavery; but all man-

mankind agree, that they ought to obey Governours, who govern well; and no man thinks it just or honourable to rebel, who has not, or cannot pretend some cause of Complaint. The trial of our Obedience is, when we suffer injuriously for Righteousness sake, when our Rights and Liberties are invaded, when we groan under such Oppressions, as are enough to make a *wise man mad*, and to transport him to irregular and unjustifiable actions. This was the Case of the Primitive Christians to whom the Apostles wrote, and therefore we might reasonably expect, that he should urge such Arguments to Subjection, as should reach their Case: but if these men be good Expositors, the Apostles says nothing to perswade any man to Obedience to the Powers, who finds the Powers uneasie and troublesome to him; and those who have nothing to *complain* of, one would think, should need no Arguments to perswade them to subjection to so easie and gentle a Yoak.

3. Nay, according to this interpretation of the Doctrine of *Subjection*, that we are bound only to be subject to those *Princes*, who rule well, who punish wickedness and reward vertue; this Doctrine

of

of *Subjection* gives no ſecurity at all to the beſt Governments in the World. The moſt Factious and Seditious Spirits can deſire no greater liberty, than this Principle grants them. For no humane Government can be ſo exact and perfect, but it may be guilty of great Miſcarriages. Good men may ſuffer, and bad men may flouriſh under a vertuous *Prince*, and therefore ill-deſigning men can never want pretences to miſrepreſent the Government, and to foment Diſcontents and Jealouſies between Prince and People. This unhappy Nation has been a ſad Example of this, twice in our Age, under two as *juſt* and *merciful Princes*, as ever ſate upon the Engliſh Throne. When there were never fewer real Grievances to be complained of, and never more loud and Tragical Complaints: and if Subjects are not bound to obey any longer than all things pleaſe and gratifie their humors, it is a vain thing to name the Doctrine of *Subjection*; which is of no uſe at all to the Peace and Security of humane Societies.

4. This is abſolutely falſe, that we are bound to be ſubject to *Soveraign Princes* no longer than they rule well, according to the meaſures of Juſtice and

and righteousness. The Apostle I am sure supposes the contrary, when he tells the Christians, *But and if ye suffer for righteousneſs sake happy are ye; and be not afraid of their terror, neither be troubled*, 1 Pet. 3. 14. Thus he commands Servants *to be subject to their Masters with fear, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward. For this is thankworthy, if a man for conscience towards God endure grief, suffering patiently. For what glory is it, if when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye take it patiently? but if when ye do well and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God*, 2 chap. 18, 19, 20. And certainly there is as perfect a subjection due to a *Soveraign Prince* as to a *Master*, for he is more eminently the Minister of God, and acts by a more sacred and inviolable authority. And that this does extend to our subjection to Princes, appears from the example of Christ, which the Apostle there recommends to our imitation, who was the most innocent person in the world, and yet suffered the most barbarous usage, not from the hands of a private Master, but of the Supreme Powers. And therefore when he commands in the same Chapter to sub-

ſubmit to Governours, *as to thoſe who are for the puniſhment of evil doers, and the praiſe of them that do well*, it is evident, that he did not intend this as a limitation of our ſubjection, as if we were not bound to be ſubject in other caſes; ſince in the very ſame Chapter, he requires ſubjection not only to the *good and gentle, but alſo to the froward*, in imitation of the Example of our Lord, who ſuffered patiently under unjuſt and tyrannical Powers.

5. I obſerve therefore, that the Apoſtle does not alledge this as the reaſon of our ſubjection, but as a motive or argument to reconcile us to the practice of it. The reaſon of our ſubjection to *Princes* is, that they are advanced by God, that they are his Miniſters, that thoſe *who reſiſt, reſiſt the ordinance of God*, and therefore *we muſt ſubmit for Gods ſake*, out of reverence to his authority. But it is an encouragement to ſubjection, to conſider the great advantages of government, that *Rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil.* But though this motive ſhould fail in ſome inſtances, yet while the reaſon of ſubjection laſts, (and that can never fail, while we own the Sovereign Authority of God) ſo long it is

our

our duty to be subject, whether our *Prince* do his duty or not.

6. But to examine more particularly the meaning of these words. When the Apostle says, That *Rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil; that they are for the punishment of evil doers, and the praise of them that do well*; I see no necessity of expounding this of good and evil works in general, that all good and virtuous Actions shall be rewarded by them, and all evil Actions punish't; for this is almost impossible in any humane Government; and there never was any Government in the World, that appointed rewards for all virtuous Actions, and punishments for all wicked ones. But these good and evil works seem to be confined to the matter in hand, to subjection and obedience, as a good and virtuous Action. And so the Apostle enforces this duty of subjection, not only from the Authority of God, but from the Power of Princes: *Be subject to the higher powers; for Rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil.* We need not fear the Powers, when we obey them, and submit our selves to them; but they will punish us if we rebel. The force of which Argument is this:

The beſt way to obtain ſafety and protection under any Government, is by being peaceable, quiet, and obedient; ſuch men generally eſcape under the greateſt *Tyrants*, for *Tyrants* themſelves do not uſe to inſult over the peaceable and obedient: but if men be ſeditious and troubleſome to Government, then *he beareth not the ſword in vain, but is the miniſter of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil:* that is, upon all diſobedience and rebellion; for whatever wickedneſs eſcapes unpuniſht, Princes for their own ſecurity muſt not ſuffer diſobedience and rebellion to eſcape. And that this is the meaning of it, appears from the next verſe, where the *Apoſtle* ſums up the whole argument for ſubjection, which he reduces to *Conſcience towards God, and fear* of the ſecular Powers: *Wherefore ye muſt needs be ſubject, not only for wrath, but alſo for conſcience ſake.* And that St. *Peter* by well doing means ſubjection to *Princes*, is very plain. *For ſo is the will of God, that with well doing, ye ſhould put to ſilence the ignorance of fooliſh men:* that is, by obedience and ſubjection to *Princes*, which is the duty he there exhorts them to. And therefore it is very probable

that he means the same by *well doing* in the verse before, that Governours are for the *punishment of evil* doers, *and the praise of them that do well*; to punish the disobedient and rebellious, and to reward and protect those, who live in all quiet and peaceable subjection. And if this be the meaning of it, I think they can find no limitation here of our *Subjection to Princes.*

7. But let us suppose, that when the *Apostle* says, that *Rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil*; he understands by it in general, the great advantages of civil government, that is, for the suppression of wickedness, and incouragement of Virtue, which is the true end and the best improvement of humane Power; this also is in a great measure true of the worst and most tyrannical Princes, and therefore the argument for Subjection is good even under a Tyrant.

Publick Justice was administred under the Government of *Nero*, and good men were rewarded, and bad men punisht: And though Justice be not so equally and so universally administred under a *bad Prince*, as under a *good* one; though a Tyrant may oppress many of his

his Subjects, and be the occasion of great Calamities, yet while there is any publick Government maintained in the World, it lays great restraints upon the unruly lusts and passions of men, and gives great security to the just and innocent. And therefore good men are concerned to promote the peace and security of Government, though the Prince be a Tyrant: for there is more Justice to be had under a *Tyrant*, than in a Civil War. In ordinary cases it is very possible for good men to live easily and tolerably under a very *bad Prince*; & though it should be their lot to suffer, yet since the peace and quiet of humane Societies is in itself so great a blessing, and the publick good is better consulted by the preservation of Government, than by resistance, it becomes every good man rather to suffer patiently under a *Tyrant*, than to shake and unsettle humane Government, and disturb the natural course of Justice by Seditions and Tumults.

8. Nay, let us suppose, that the Apostle here speaks of such an equal administration of Justice, as cannot be expected under the Government of a *Tyrant*; yet so the argument holds good against resistance, though our *Prince* be

never so bad. And it lies thus: We must not resist the Powers, because *Rulers are not a terrour to good works, but to the evil.* This is the great blessing of humane Government, to preserve Justice and Righteousness among Men. For this reason God has intrusted the *Princes* with the Power of the Sword, for *the punishment of evil doers, and the praise of them that do well*; and therefore we must not resist him, because publick Justice is so great a blessing to the World. But how does this follow, you will say, that we must not resist a Tyrant, who is so far from administring Justice, that he oppresses his subjects, because Civil Government and Publick Justice is so great a blessing? what agreement is there between Civil Government, and Publick Justice, and a Tyrant? Why the consequence is very plain. Civil Government, which is for the administration of publick Justice, is a great and inestimable blessing to the World: but now there can be no Civil Government without a supream and irresistible Power; Publick Justice cannot be administred, unless there is some Power from whence there is no appeal. It is not necessary indeed, that the

Power

Power ſhould always be in the hands of one Man; but if God have placed this Power in the hands of a Prince, there it muſt be irreſiſtible too, however he uſes it: for if once it be made lawful to reſiſt the ſupream Power, where-ever it is plac'd, you diſſolve humane Societies, or at leaſt expoſe them to perpetual Diſorders and Convulſions. Factious and ambitious men will find pretences to reſiſt good Princes as well as the bad, and no Government can be any longer ſecure, than while ill-deſigning men want Power to reſiſt. Now then, to paſs a true Judgment of this matter, we muſt not only conſider, what preſent inconveniencies we may ſuffer from the irreſiſtible Power of a Tyrant, but what an irreparable miſchief it is for ever to unſettle the Foundations of Government. We muſt conſider whether Civil Government be the greater Bleſſing to Mankind, or a *Tyrant* the greater Curſe: whether it be more deſirable to endure the inſolence and injuſtice of a Tyrant, when the Power falls into ſuch a hand, or for ever to be deprived of the ſecurity of Government, and the bleſſings of Peace and Order. And therefore there is great reaſon, why God ſhould

so severely forbid the resistance of Princes, though *Tyrants*; and why we should quietly and contentedly submit to this divine appointment, because the resistance of the Supreme Power, were it once allowed by God, would weaken the authority of human Governments, and expose them to the rage and frenzie of ambitious and discontented Statesmen, or wild Enthusiasts. This I think is a sufficient answer to this pretence, that the Apostle limits our subjection to Princes to the regular exercise of their authority.

3. It is objected also from St. *Peter*'s words, that the inferiour and subordinate Magistrates receive their Power from God also, as well as *Supreme* and *Soveraign Princes*; Governours are sent *by him*; that is, say they, by God, for *the punishment of evil doers and the praise of them that do well*; and therefore though private men may not resist a *Soveraign Prince*, yet publick Magistrates may, though they be not supreme; for it is their Duty also to see wickedness punish'd, and virtue rewarded; and therefore it is part of their *Commission* to give check to the Soveraign Power, and to defend Subjects from the

un-

unjuſt violence and oppreſſions of their *Prince*. And this the Emperour *Trajan* learnt from the common principles of Juſtice and Equity, who delivered a Sword to one of his Officers with this charge, to uſe it for him, while he governed well, but againſt him if he governed ill. Now in anſwer to this, we may conſider.

1. That there is no foundation at all for this in the *Text*, for this δι' αὐτοῦ, or *by him*, cannot by any Rules of Grammar be referred to God, but to the *King*. *Submit to every ordinance of man for the Lord's ſake, whether to the King as ſupreme, or unto Governours, as unto them who are ſent by him. By him?* by whom? by God? that is not ſaid, but by the *King*, for that is the next antecedent; and that is the evident truth of the caſe. Inferiour Magiſtrates do not receive their power from *God*, but from the *King*, who having the Soveraign Power in himſelf, commits the exerciſe of ſome part of it to others, and taketh it away again, when he pleaſes And the very phraſe of πεμπομένοις δι' αὐτοῦ, thoſe who are ſent by him, plainly refers it to thoſe who were ſent by the Emperour into Forreign Countries, to Go-

vern the *Roman Provinces*; such as *Pontius Pilate* and *Felix* were: And so the meaning is, that they were not only obliged to submit to the *Roman Emperours*, but to all those Governours, whom they sent to Rule the Provinces under their Jurisdiction; which is no more than for a Preacher to instruct the Subjects of *Ireland*, that they must not only submit to the King, but to all those whom he sent to govern them, with the Power and Authority of *Deputies*, or *Lord Lieutenants*.

2. Nay St. *Peter*, as if he had foreseen this objection, takes particular care to prevent it, and therefore makes an apparent difference between that submission we owe to *Soveraign Princes*, and that which we owe to Governours; we must submit *to the King as Supreme*, ὡς ὑπερέχοντι, as to him who is above all, whose Power is unaccountable and irresistible; but *to Governours, as unto them who are sent by him:* which both signifies the reason of our submission to Governours, and prescribes the bounds and measures of it.

The reason why we must submit to *Governours*, is because they are sent by our *Prince*, they act by his Authority, and

and therefore we muſt ſubmit to, and reverence his Authority in them. It is not for their own ſakes, nor for any inherent Authority in them, but as they receive their Power from our *Prince*.

And this alſo determines the bounds and meaſures of our ſubjection to Governours. As that Authority, which they receive from the *King*, is the only reaſon why we muſt ſubmit to them at all; ſo we muſt ſubmit no longer, than that Authority laſts; when ever the *Prince* recalls them, and transfers this Power to another, we muſt obey them no longer. Nay, ſince we are only bound to reverence and obey the authority of our *Prince* in them, we muſt never ſubmit to them in oppoſition to our *Prince*. Our primary Obligation is to ſubmit to the *King*, who is our *Soveraign Lord*, and muſt in no caſes be reſiſted; our ſubmiſſion to Governours and ſubordinate Magiſtrates is only a part and branch of our duty to the *King*, as they are his Officers and Miniſters: and therefore it can never be our duty to obey or comply with ſubordinate Magiſtrates, but only when it is an act of duty and ſubjection to our *Prince*: and certainly it is no act of ſubjection

to

to our *Prince* to obey subordinate Magistrates, when they rebel against their *Prince*: for, to resist a *Prince*, or to joyn with those who do resist him, is an odd kind of instance of our Subjection to him. This is not to submit to the *King as supreme, nor to Governours, as unto those who are sent by him*, and receive their Authority from him; but it is to submit to Governours, as the supreme and soveraign *Judges* of our *Prince*, and the *Patrons* and *Protectors* of the *People* against their *Prince*; which is directly contrary to St. *Peter*'s Doctrine.

It was no new thing for the Governours of remote *Provinces* to revolt from the obedience of the *Roman Emperours*, and to usurp a Soveraign and Imperial Authority to themselves; and therefore St. *Peter* expresses their Duty to Governours with this caution and limitation, that though they must submit to those, whom the Emperour sent to Govern them, yet it must be in subordination to the Imperial Authority, and with a reserve of that more absolute subjection, which they owe to the Emperour himself, who is their *Soveraign Lord*. While Governours are subject to the Emperour, who is their Lord and Master,

ſter, we muſt be ſubject to them; but if they rebel, we muſt be ſubject to the Emperour ſtill, and oppoſe thoſe, whom we were before bound to obey.

When St. *Peter* ſo expreſly commands them both to ſubmit to the *King*, and to ſubmit to Governours, it is impoſſible he could conſider the *King* and Governours, as two diſtinct and rival authorities; for then it might ſo happen, that they could not ſubmit to both, if ever they ſhould oppoſe each other: and therefore when he commands them to ſubmit to both, he muſt ſuppoſe them to be both one, as the Fountain and the Stream is one. The Authority to which they muſt ſubmit is but one, it is originally in the *King*, as in its ſource and fountain, and it is derived and communicated to Governours; but is the ſame Power ſtill, which as neceſſarily depends upon the King, as Light does upon the Sun; and therefore when theſe Powers grow two, when this derivative and dependant Power ſets up for itſelf, in oppoſition to that Power which gave it its being, we are delivered from our ſubjection to it, becauſe it ceaſes to be one with that ſoveraign Power, to which we muſt be ſubject.

Once

Once more. St. *Peter* commands the Christians to submit to the *King*, and to *Governours*, that is, to the King's Ministers, who receive their Authority from him to govern. But when such Persons rebel against their *Prince* who gave them authority, they cease to be the King's Ministers and Governours, and therefore cease to be such Governours to whom the Apostle commands submission. We are to obey them while they are the *King*'s Ministers and Deputies; but when they assume to themselves an independant Power, we must submit to them no longer, but to our *Prince*: We may and ought to obey our *Prince*, and those Magistrates whom he sets over us, but we cannot submit to our *Prince* and to *Rebels*; and certainly when Men become *Rebels*, they are no longer the *King*'s Ministers, but his Rivals.

3. It is a very ridiculous pretence also, which has no foundation in St. *Peter*'s words, that Governours or subordinate Magistrates have Power to controul or resist their *Soveraign Prince*. The Apostle tells us, that the King is supreme; but over whom is he supreme? certainly over all in his Dominions, or else he is not supreme; and therefore he

is

is ſupreme with reſpect to ſubordinate Magiſtrates, as well as private Subjects; and then they have no more Power or Authority to reſiſt, than any private Subject has. For St. *Paul* tells us, the *higher Power* is irreſiſtible; which would be a ſtrange Paradox, if every little Officer had Authority to reſiſt him.

And yet if Men will grant, that it is never lawful for any private man to reſiſt his *Prince*, it is not worth diſputing, whether ſubordinate Magiſtrates may or not; for if private men muſt not reſiſt, theſe inferiour Magiſtrates cannot, or at leaſt they will reſiſt to no purpoſe. He may make them private men again when he pleaſes; or however, he muſt be an *unfortunate Prince*, whom all his own Officers and Miniſters conſpire againſt; and he muſt be a very *weak Prince*, who has not force and power to oppoſe them. For what does the diſcontent of the greateſt *Miniſters* ſignifie, who can raiſe no forces to oppoſe their *Prince?* and yet there are no forces to be raiſed, if private men muſt not reſiſt. When inferiour Magiſtrates muſt ſubmit, or rebel alone, (as they muſt do, if private men muſt not rebel) whatever autho-

authority they have to controul their Prince, they will want force and power to do it. And yet it would be a leud way of burlesquing this Doctrine of *Non-Resistance*, to make no more of it than this, that when St. *Paul* so severely threatens damnation against those who resist, his meaning is, that private Subjects must not resist their Prince, unless they have some discontented and factious Magistrates to head them.

But how should these *subordinate Governours* come by this Power to resist their *Prince*? They must either have it from God, or from their Prince. Not from God. For Soveraign Princes receive their authority from God; and if God have bestowed the Supreme and Soveraign Power on the Prince, it is a contradiction to say, that he has advanced his own Ministers and Officers above him; which would be to place a superiour Power over the supreme. Nor is it reasonable to suppose, that inferiour Magistrates receive such a Power as this from their *Prince*, though it is evident, they have no Power, but what they receive from him. For notwithstanding *Trajan*'s Complement, which he never intended should be made a Law for himself,

ſelf, or other Soveraign Princes; no Prince can give ſuch Power as this to a Subject, without giving him his Crown. He gives away his Soveraign Power, when he gives any Subject authority to reſiſt; he ceaſes to be a *Soveraign Prince*, if he makes any man his Superior: for he cannot give away Soveraign Power, and yet keep it himſelf. And it would be a hard caſe with Princes, had they as many Judges and Maſters, as they have Officers and Miniſters of State. Indeed, no Prince without parting with his Crown, can grant ſuch an extravagant Power to any *Subject*: for while he continues *Soveraign*, God has made it neceſſary to the greateſt *Subjects* to obey and ſubmit. For as for *Trajan*'s ſaying to one of his Commanders, when he delivered him the Sword, *Uſe this for me if I govern well, and againſt me if I govern ill*, it only ſignified his fixt reſolution to govern well, and that he would imploy it in no ill ſervices: but it conveyed no more Power to him to rebel, if he ſhould govern ill, than a Father's ſaying to his Son, that he ſhould forgive his diſobedience, if ever he would prove unkind, would juſtifie the diſobedience of the Son, if his Father ſhould prove

un-

unkind. The duties of these relations are fixt by God, and cannot be altered by men. A *Prince* may divest himself of his Kingdom, and Royal Power; but while he continues Soveraign, he cannot give liberty to any man to resist him.

4. There is another objection not only to invalidate St. *Peter*'s Authority, but to answer all the arguments that are produced from the Doctrine and Practice of Christ and his Apostles, to inforce this duty of *Non-resistance* and *Subjection* to Princes; and that is, that these commands were only temporary, and obliged Christians while they wanted force and power to resist, but do not oblige us, when we can resist and conquer too.

I have sometimes thought, that this objection ought to be answered only with indignation and abhorrence, as an open contempt of the authority of the Scriptures, and blasphemy against the holy Spirit, by which they were indited; but it may be, it is better to answer and expose it, and let the world see, besides the notorious folly of it, how near a kin the Doctrine of Resistance is to Atheism, Infidelity, and Blasphemy.

1. First

1. First then I obſerve, that this very objection ſuppoſes that the Doctrine of the Goſpel is againſt Reſiſtance; for thoſe who evade the authority of the Scriptures, by ſaying, that Chriſtians were then forbid to reſiſt, becauſe they wanted power to conquer, muſt grant, that reſiſtance is forbid. Which is a plain confeſſion, that they are conſcious to themſelves, that all the arts they have us'd to make the Scriptures ſpeak their ſence, and juſtifie the Doctrine of Reſiſtance, will not do. And therefore when men are once reduced to this laſt refuge, to confeſs, that the Scriptures are againſt them, if they have any modeſty left, they ought never to pretend to the authority of the Scriptures in this cauſe more. And this is a ſufficient anſwer to all men, who have any reverence for the authority of the Scriptures, that they cannot reſiſt their *Prince* without diſobeying the plain and expreſs Laws of the Goſpel; for he is a bold man, who will venture his eternal Salvation, upon pleading his exemption from any expreſs Law.

2. I would deſire all men who have any reverence left for the Religion of our Saviour, to conſider ſeriouſly how

this pretence does disparage and weaken the authority of the Gospel, and make it a very imperfect, and a very uncertain Rule of Life, which every man may fit and accommodate to his own humour and inclinations.

Christ and his Apostles do in the most express terms, and under the most severe penalties, forbid the resistance of Soveraign Princes. But say these men, this Law does not oblige us now, though it did oblige the Christians of those days; for our circumstances are much changed and altered. The Christians at that time were weak, and unable to resist, and therefore were taught to suffer patiently without resistance; but thanks be to God, the case is not thus now; and therefore we may vindicate our Natural and Religious Rights and Liberties against all unjust violence. Now observe what follows from hence:

1. That the Gospel of our Saviour is a very imperfect and uncertain Rule of Life; that it absolutely forbids things, which are not absolutely evil, but sometimes lawful, without allowing for such a difference: that it gives general Laws, which oblige only at certain times, or in some circumstances, without giving any

any notice in what caſes they do not oblige; which is a mighty ſnare to mens conſciences, or a great injury to their Chriſtian liberty. It impoſes this hard neceſſity upon them, either to make bold with a Divine Law, if they do reſiſt Tyrannical Powers, which is grievous to a tender Conſcience, which has any reverence for God; or to ſuffer injuriouſly, when they need not, had they been plainly inſtructed in their Duty, and acquainted in what caſes they might reſiſt, and in what not. And I think, there cannot be a greater reproach to the Goſpel, than to make it ſuch an imperfect and enſnaring Rule.

2. Nay, this charges Chriſt and his Apoſtles with want of ſincerity in preaching the Goſpel; for either they knew, that this Doctrine of Non-Reſiſtance did not oblige all Chriſtians, but only thoſe who are weak and unable to reſiſt, or they did not. If we ſay they did not, we charge them with ignorance; if we ſay they did, with diſhoneſty: for if they knew, that all Chriſtians were not obliged to ſuch an abſolute ſubjection to Princes, as in no caſe to reſiſt, why did they conceal ſo important a truth, without giving the leaſt

intimation of it? Did they think this so scandalous a Doctrine, that they were afraid or ashamed to publish it to the World? And can any thing be a Doctrine of the Gospel, which is truly scandalous? But was the Doctrine of *Resistance* more scandalous, than the Doctrine of the *Cross*? Would this have offended *Princes*, and make them more implacable Enemies to Christianity? But would it not also have made more Converts? would not a liberty to resist the Powers, and defend themselves, been a better inducement to embrace Christianity, than a necessity of suffering the worst things for the Name of Christ? would not this have contributed very much to the Conversion of the whole *Jewish Nation*, who were fond of a *Temporal Kingdom*, had Christianity allowed them to cast off the *Roman* Yoke, and restored their ancient Liberties? How soon should we have seen the *Cross* in their *Banners*, and how gladly would they have fought under that victorious Sign, under the conduct of so many wonder-working Prophets, and how soon would this have made the Doctrine of *Non-Resistance* useless and out of date, by making Christians powerful enough

nough to reſiſt? So that there is no imaginable reaſon, why Chriſt and his Apoſtles ſhould conceal this Doctrine of the lawfulneſs of reſiſting perſecuting and tyrannical Powers, eſpecially at that time, when if it had been lawful, there was as much uſe for it, and as great reaſon to preach it, as ever there was, or ever can be. And therefore we muſt either think very ill of our Saviour and his Apoſtles, or acknowledge, that this is no Goſpel-Doctrine, never was, and never can be any part of the Religion of the Croſs. There is no reaſon, why Chriſt ſhould at firſt plant Chriſtianity in the world by ſufferings, if it might afterwards be maintained and propagated by glorious Rebellions.

3. If this plea be allowed, it weakens the Authority of all the Laws of the Goſpel, and leaves men at liberty to diſpence with themſelves, when they ſee or fancy any reaſon for it. *Non-Reſiſtance* is as abſolutely commanded, as any other Law of the Goſpel; but theſe men imagin, without any other reaſon, but becauſe they would have it ſo, that this Law only concerned Chriſtians in the weak and Infant-ſtate of the Church, while they were unable to reſiſt. Now ſhould o-

ther men take the same liberty with other Laws (and I know no reason but why they may) how easie were it to expound Christianity out of the world? Meekness, patience, humility, self-denial, contempt of the world, forgiving enemies, contentment in all conditions, are parts and branches of this suffering Religion; and may we not with as much reason say, that these duties were calculated for the afflicted and suffering state of the Church, when the profession of Christianity was discouraged in the world, and exposed them to the loss of all things, and therefore made it impossible for them to enjoy those pleasures and advantages of life, which other men did; but that they do not more oblige us than resistance, now the Church is flourishing and prosperous? And thus men may justifie their pride and ambition and covetousness, and may be as very Idolaters of the Riches and Pleasures and Honours of the World, as Heathens themselves, when Christianity became the Religion of the Empire: it did indeed make too great an alteration in the lives of Christians. But according to this way of reasoning, it made as great an alteration in Religion itself; at this rate we ought

ought to have two Gospels, one for the afflicted, the other for the prosperous state of the Church; which differ as much as *Christianity* and *Paganism* in the great Rules of Life. But we are hard dealt with, that we have but one Gospel, and that the Suffering Gospel; and for my part, I dare not undertake to make another. So that this plea for resistance in opposition to the plain and express Laws of the Gospel, in the consequences of it, strikes at the very Foundations of Christianity, and becomes the mouth of none but an *Atheist* or an *Infidel*.

4. This is a very absurd pretence, that the Apostle forbids the Christians of those days to resist, onely because they were weak, and unable to resist. This is a great reproach to the Apostle, as if he were of the temper of some men, who crouch and flatter, and pretend great Loyalty, when they are afraid to rebel, but are loyal no longer than they have an opportunity to rebel. This is dissimulation and flattery, and inconsistent with the open simplicity of the Apostolick Spirit; but it is very strange that the Apostle should so severely forbid resistance, when he knew they could not resist. One would think common

Prudence should teach such Men to be quiet and subject; and therefore his zeal and vehemence would perswade one, that as weak as the Christians were, yet in those days they could have resisted. Nay, it is evident, that there were a sort of men who in those days called themselves Christians, and yet did resist the Powers; such were the *Gnostick Hereticks*, who *despised Government*, who were *presumptuous and self-willed*, and were *not afraid to speak evil of dignities*, 2 Peter 2. 10. Jude *v.* 8. for to reproach and vilifie Government, is one degree of resistance; and no men are so weak, but they may do that. Nay, though Christians had not power enough of their own to have rebelled against the *Roman Government*, yet they had opportunity enough to joyn and conspire with those who had, and to have made good terms and conditions for themselves. They lived in a very factious age, when both Jews and Heathens were very apt to rebel, and could both have promoted and strengthned the Faction, if they had pleased, and have grown very acceptable to them by doing so; and though no Man knows what the event of any Rebellion will be,

till

till he tries, yet they might have eſcaped as well as other men. This the Apoſtle knew, and this he was afraid of, and this he warns them againſt; and that for ſuch reaſons, as plainly ſhew, that it was not a meer prudential advice he gives them, for that time, but a ſtanding Law of their Religion.

5. For this Doctrine of *Non-reſiſtance* is urged with ſuch reaſons and arguments, as are good in all ages of the Church, as well when Chriſtians have power to reſiſt and conquer, as when they have not. Thus (1.) St. *Paul* inforces this duty of ſubjection to the *Higher Powers*, becauſe *all powers are of God; the powers that be are ordained of God*; and therefore *he that reſiſteth the powers, reſiſteth the Ordinance of God.* Now if they muſt obey the powers, becauſe they are from God, *Subjection* and *Non-reſiſtance* is as much our duty, when we have power to reſiſt, as when we have not; and is as much our duty at this day, as it was in the time of the Apoſtle, if we believe, that God has as great a hand in ſetting up Kings now, as he had then.

2. He threatens eternal damnation againſt thoſe, who reſiſt: *He that reſiſts ſhall*

shall receive unto himself damnation: which supposes, that there is a moral Evil in resistance, and therefore that Non-resistance is an eternal and unchangable Law: which cannot be true, if it be lawful to resist, when we can resist to some purpose, when we can resist and conquer. It is foolish indeed to resist a *Prince*, when we have not sufficient force to oppose against him; but it would be a hard case, if a man should perish eternally, for doing an action, which is lawful in itself, but imprudently undertaken. These Men had need look well to themselves, how lawful soever they think resistance to be, if every imprudent and unfortunate Rebel must be damned.

3. St. *Paul* adds, that *we must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake*; that is, not only out of fear of men, but out of Conscience of our duty to God. Now if Resistance were not in its nature sinful, it were a very prudential Consideration, not to resist for fear of wrath, that is, for fear of being punisht by men, if we cannot conquer; but there would be no conscience in the case, no sense of any duty to God; unless we think, that *Non-resistance* is our duty,

duty when we cannot conquer, and Resistance when we can.

4. St. *Peter* tells us, that this subjections to Kings and Governours is a good and vertuous action, and therefore he calls it *well-doing: For so is the will of God, that with well-doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men*; that is, by submitting to *Kings* and *Governours*, as you have already heard. Now the nature of Vertue and Vice cannot alter with the circumstances of our condition; that which is good in one age, is so in another; which shews, that *Subjection* and *Non-resistance* was not a temporary Law, and meer matter of prudence, but an essential duty of Christian Religion.

5. For it appears by what he adds, that it was a great credit and reputation to Christianity, that it made men quiet, peaceable, and governable: *By well-doing they put to silence the ignorance of foolish men*; by their peaceable and obedient behaviour to their Governors, they sham'd those men, who ignorantly reproach'd the Christian Religion. Now hence there are two plain consequents:

1. That subjection to Government is a thing of very good repute in the world,

or

or else it could be no credit to Christianity; and this is a good argument that subjection to Government is a great Vertue, because all men speak well of it. It is a thing of *good report*, and therefore becomes Christians, 4 *Phil.* 8.

2. It hence follows also, that subjection to Government was a standing Doctrine of the Christian Religion, because it was the will of God, that they should recommend Christianity to the World by *Subjection* to *Princes*. But certainly God never intended they should put a cheat upon the World, and recommend Christianity to them, by that, which is no part nor duty of Christianity.

This is abundantly sufficient to confute that vain pretence, that the Doctrine of *Subjection* and *Non-resistance* obliged Christians only, while they were unable to resist and defend themselves; and this is enough to satisfie us, what the Doctrine of the Apostles was about subjection to *Princes*.

As for their examples, I think there was never any dispute about that. It is sufficiently known, that they suffered Martyrdom, as a vast number of Christians in that and some following Ages did, without either reproaching their Gover-

Governours, or rebelling againſt them: and this they did, as they taught others to do, not meerly becauſe they could not reſiſt, but out of duty and reverence to God, who ſets Princes on Thrones, and has given them a ſacred and inviolable Authority; and in imitation of their great Lord and Maſter, who went as a Lamb to the ſlaughter, and as a ſheep before the ſhearer is dumb, ſo he opened not his mouth.

CHAP. VI.

An ANSWER *to the moſt Popular Objections againſt* NON-RESISTANCE.

I Proceed now to conſider thoſe Objections, which are made againſt the Doctrine of *Non-reſiſtance*; though methinks after ſuch plain and convincing proof, that *Non-reſiſtance* is the Doctrine both of the Old and New Teſtament, though witty men may be able to ſtart ſome Objections, yet wiſe and good men ſhould not regard them: for no Obje-

objection is of any force, against a plain and expreſs Law of God. Indeed, when we have no evidence for a thing but only Natural Reaſon, and the reaſon ſeems to be equally ſtrong and cogent on both ſides, it renders the matter very doubtful, on which ſide the truth lies: But when on one ſide there is a plain and expreſs *Revelation* of the will of God, and on the other ſide ſome ſhew and appearance of reaſon, I think there can be no diſpute, which ſide we chuſe; unleſs any man think it doubtful, which is the moſt certain and infallible Rule, *Scripture* or *meer Natural Reaſon.* And therefore till men can anſwer that Scripture-evidence, which I have produced, (which I am not much concerned about, for I gueſs it will take them up ſome time to do it) all their other objections, whether I could anſwer them or not, ſignifie nothing at all to me, and ought to ſignifie as little to any man, who reverences the Scriptures. But let us conſider their objections; for they are not ſo formidable, that we need be afraid of them.

Now I know no body, but will acknowledge, that in moſt caſes it is the duty of Subjects not to reſiſt their *Prince*; but they only pretend, that this is not their

their duty, when their *Prince* oppreſſes and perſecutes them contrary to Law: when their Lives and Liberties and Properties and Religion are all ſecured by the Laws of the Land, they ſee no reaſon why they ſhould tamely ſuffer a *Prince* to uſurp upon them, why they ſhould not defend themſelves againſt all unjuſt and illegal violence; and they urge ſeveral arguments to prove, that they may do ſo; which may be reduced to theſe five.

1. That they are bound by no Law to ſuffer againſt Law. 2. That the Prince has no authority againſt Law. 3. That they have a natural Right of Self-defence againſt unjuſt Violence. 4. That otherwiſe we deſtroy the diſtinction between an *Abſolute* and *Limited* Monarch; between a *Prince* whoſe *Will* is his Law, and a *Prince* who is bound to govern by Law; which undermines the Fundamental Conſtitution of the Engliſh Government. 5. That if Reſiſtance in no caſe be allowed, the miſchiefs and inconveniences to Mankind may be intolerable. I ſuppoſe it will be acknowledged, that theſe five particulars do contain the whole ſtrength of their cauſe; and if I can give a fair anſwer

swer to them, it must either make men Loyal, or leave them without excuse.

1. They urge, that they are bound by no Law to suffer against Law. Suppose, as a late Author does, that a Popish Prince should persecute his Protestant Subjects in *England* for professing the Protestant Religion which is established by Law: *By what Law* (says he) *must we die? not by any Law of God surely, for being of that Religion, which he approves, and would have all the world to embrace, and to hold fast to the end. Nor by the Laws of our Country, where Protestancy is so far from being criminal, that it is death to desert it, and to turn Papist. By what Law then? by none that I know of*, says our *Author*: nor do I know of any; and so far we are agreed. But then both the Laws of God and of our Country, command us not to resist: and if death, an illegal unjust death follow upon that, I cannot help it: God and our Country must answer for it. It is a wonderful discovery, which this *Author* has made, that when we suffer against Law, we are condemned by no Law to die; for if we were, we could not suffer against Law: and it is as wonderful an argu-

Julian the Apostate.

argument he uſes to prove, that we may reſiſt, when we are perſecuted againſt Law, becauſe we are condemned by no Law to dye; which is ſuppoſed in the very Queſtion, and is neither more nor leſs, than to affirm the thing which he was to prove. We may reſiſt a Prince who perſecutes againſt Law, becauſe we are condemned by no Law, that is, becauſe he perſecutes againſt Law. This proves indeed, that we ought not to dye, when we are condemned by no Law to dye; but whether we may preſerve our ſelves from an unjuſt and violent death by reſiſting a perſecuting Prince, is another queſtion.

2. It is urged, That a Prince has no Authority againſt Law; *There is no Authority on Earth above the Law, much leſs againſt it. It is Murder to put a man to death againſt Law; and if they knew who had authority to commit open, bare-faced, and downright Murders, this would direct them where to pay their Paſſive Obedience; but it would be the horrideſt ſlander in the world to ſay, that any ſuch Power is lodged in the Prerogative, as to deſtroy men contrary to Law.*

Now I perfectly agree with them in this alſo, that a *Prince* has no juſt and le-

gal authority to act against Law; that if he knowingly persecute any Subject to death contrary to Law, he is a Murderer, and that no *Prince* has any such *Prerogative* to commit *open, bare-faced and downright murders.* But what follows from hence? does it hence follow, therefore we may resist and oppose them, if they do? This I absolutely deny; because God has expresly commanded us not to resist: And I see no inconsistency between these two propositions, that a *Prince* has no Legal Authority to persecute against Law, and yet that he must not be resisted, when he does. Both the Laws of God, and the Laws of our Country, suppose these two to be very consistent. For notwithstanding the possibility, that *Princes* may abuse their power, and transgress the Laws, whereby they ought to govern; yet they Command Subjects in no case to resist: and it is not sufficient to justifie resistance, if Princes do, what they have no just Authority to do, unless we have also a just Authority to resist. He, who exceeds the just bounds of his Authority, is liable to be called to an account for it; but he is accountable only to those, who have a superior Authority

thority to call him to an account. No Power whatever is accountable to an inferiour; for this is a contradiction to the very Notion of Power, and destructive of all Order and Government. Inferiour Magistrates are on all hands acknowledged to be liable to give an account of the abuse of their Power; but to whom must they give an account? not to their inferiours; not to the people, whom they are to Govern, but to superiour Magistrates, or to the *Soveraign Prince*, who governs all. Thus the *Soveraign Prince* may exceed his Authority, and is accountable for it to a superiour Power; but because he has no superiour Power on Earth, he cannot be resisted by his own Subjects, but must be reserved to the Judgment of God, who alone is the *King of Kings*. To justifie our resistance of any Power, there are two things to be proved. 1. That this Power has exceeded its just Authority. 2. That we have Authority to resist. Now these men indeed prove the first very well, that *Princes*, who are to govern by Law, exceed their Legal Authority when they persecute against Law: but hey say not one word of the second, hat Subjects have Authority to resist

their *Prince*, who persecutes against Law; which was the only thing that needed proof: but this is a hard Task, and therefore they thought it more adviseable to take it for granted, than to attempt to prove it. They say indeed, *that an inauthoritative act, which carries no Obligation at all, cannot oblige Subjects to obedience.* Now this is manifestly true, if by Obedience they mean an *Active Obedience*; for I am not bound to do an ill thing, or an illegal action, because my *Prince* commands me; but if they mean *Passive Obedience*, it is as manifestly false; for I am bound to obey, that is, not to resist my *Prince*, when he offers the most unjust and illegal Violence.

Nay, it is very false and absurd to say, that every illegal, is an inauthoritative Act, which carries no Obligation with it. This is contrary to the practice of all *humane Judicatures*, and the daily Experience of men, who suffer in their Lives, Bodies, or Estates by an unjust and illegal Sentence. Every Judgment contrary to the true meaning of the Law, is in that sense illegal; and yet such illegal Judgments have their Authority and Obligation, till they are rescinded by some

ſome higher Authority. This is the true Reaſon of Appeals from inferiour to ſuperiour Courts, to rectifie illegal Proceedings, and reverſe illegal Judgments; which ſuppoſes that ſuch illegal Acts have Authority, till they are made null and void by a higher Power: and if the higher Powers, from whence lies no Appeal, confirm and ratifie an unjuſt and illegal Sentence, it carries ſo much Authority and Obligation with it, that the injured perſon has no redreſs, but muſt patiently ſubmit; and thus it muſt neceſſarily be, or there can be no end of diſputes, nor any Order and Government in humane Societies.

And this is a plain demonſtration, that though the Law be the Rule according to which *Princes* ought to Exerciſe their Authority and Power, yet the Authority is not in *Laws*, but in *Perſons*; for otherwiſe why is not a Sentence pronounced according to Law by a private Perſon, of as much Authority, as a Sentence pronounced by a Judge? How does an illegal Sentence, pronounced by a Judge, come to have any Authority? for a Sentence contrary to Law, cannot have the Authority of the Law. Why is a legal or illegal Sentence reverſible,

and alterable, when pronounced by one Judge, and irreversible and unalterable, when pronounced by another? For the Law is the same, and the Sentence is the same, either according to Law or against it, whoever the Judge be; but it seems the Authority of the Persons is not the same, and that makes the difference; so that there is an Authority in Persons, in some sense distinct from the Authority of Laws, nay superiour to it. For there is such an Authority, as, though it cannot make an illegal act legal, yet, can and often does make an illegal act binding and obligatory to the Subjects, when pronounced by a competent Judge.

If it be said, that this very Authority is owing to the Law, which appoints Judges and Magistrates to decide Controversies, and orders Appeals from inferiour to superiour Courts: I would only ask one short Question, Whether the Law gives Authority to any person to judge contrary to Law. If it does not, then all illegal Acts are null and void, and lay no Obligation on the Subject; and yet this is manifestly false, according to the known Practice of all the known Governments in the World.

The

The moſt illegal Judgment is valid, till it be reverſt by ſome ſuperiour Power; and the Judgment of the ſupreme Power, though never ſo illegal, can be repealed by no Authority but its own. And yet it is abſurd to ſay, that the Law gives any man Authority to judge contrary to Law: for, to be ſure, this is beſides the end and intention of the Law. Whence then does an illegal Act or Judgment derive its Authority and Obligation? the Anſwer is plain, It is from the Authority of the *Perſon*, whoſe Act or Judgment it is.

It will be of great uſe to this Controverſie, to make this plain and obvious to every Underſtanding; which therefore I ſhall endeavour to do, as briefly as may be.

1. Then I obſerve, that there muſt be a perſonal Power and Authority antecedent to all Civil Laws. For there can be no Laws without a Law-maker, and there can be no Law-maker, unleſs there be one or more perſons inveſted with the power of Government, of which making Laws is one Branch. For a Law is nothing elſe but the publick and declared will and command of the Law-maker, whether he be the *Soveraign Prince*, or the *People*.

2. And hence it necessarily follows, that a *Soveraign Prince* does not receive his Authority from the Laws, but Laws receive their Authority from him. We are often indeed minded of what *BRACTON* says, LEX FACIT REGEM, that the Law makes the King; by which that great *Lawyer* was far enough from understanding, that the *King* receives his Soveraign Power from the Law; for the Law has no Authority, nor can give any, but what it receives from the *King*; and then it is a wonderful Riddle, how the King should receive his Authority from the Law. But when he says, *The Law makes the King*, he distinguishes a *King* from a *Tyrant*, and his meaning is, that to Govern by Laws, makes a *Soveraign Prince* a *King*, as King signifies a just and equal and beneficial Power and Authority; as appears from the Reason he gives for it, *Non est enim Rex, ubi dominatur voluntas, & non lex*; He is no King, who Governs by Arbitrary Will, and not by Law: not that he is no Soveraign *Prince*, but he is a *Tyrant* and not a *King*.

3. And hence it evidently follows, that the being of Soveraign Power is independent on Laws; that is, as a *Soveraign*

raign Prince does not receive his Power from the Law, ſo, ſhould he violate the Laws by which he is bound to Govern, yet he does not forfeit his Power. He breaks his Faith to God and to his Country, but he is a *Soveraign Prince* ſtill. And this is in effect acknowledged by theſe men, who ſo freely confeſs, that let a *Prince* be what he will, though he trample upon all Laws, and exerciſe an Arbitrary and Illegal Authority, yet his Perſon is ſacred and inviolable, and irreſiſtible; he muſt not be touch'd nor oppoſed. And allow that ſaying of *David* to be Scripture ſtill, *Who can ſtretch forth his hand againſt the Lord's Anointed, and be guiltleſs?* Now what is it, that makes the Perſon of a King more inviolable and unaccountable than other men? Nothing, that I know of, but his ſacred and inviolable Authority: and therefore it ſeems, though he act againſt Law, yet he is a *Soveraign Prince*, and the *Lord's Anointed* ſtill; or elſe I ſee no reaſon, why they might not deſtroy his Perſon alſo. And yet if nothing but an inviolable and unaccountable Authority can make the *Perſon* of the *King* inviolable and unaccountable, I would gladly know, how it becomes lawful to

reſiſt

resist his Authority, and unlawful to resist his Person. I would desire these men to tell me, whether a *Soveraign Prince* signifies the natural Person, or the Authority of a King; and if to divest him of his Authority, be to kill the *King*, why they may not kill the man too, when they have killed the *King*. Thus when men are forc't to mince Treason and Rebellion, they always speak Nonsense. Those indeed who resist the Authority of their *Prince*, but spare his *Person*, do better than those, who kill him; but those who affirm, that his *Person* is as resistible and accountable as his *Authority*, speak more consistently with themselves, and the Principles of Rebellion.

4. And hence I suppose, it plainly appears, that every illegal Act the *King* does, is not *an inauthoritative Act*, but laies an Obligation on Subjects to yield, if not an *Active*, yet a *Passive* Obedience. For the *King* receives not his Soveraign Authority from the Law, nor does he forfeit his Authority by breaking the Law; and therefore he is a *Soveraign Prince* still; and his most illegal Acts, though they have not the Authority of the Law, yet they have the Authority of Soveraign Power

Power, which is irresistible and unaccountable.

In a word, it does not become any man who can think three Consequences off, to talk of the Authority of Laws in derogation to the Authority of the Soveraign Power. The Soveraign Power made the Laws, and can repeal them, and dispence with them, and make new Laws; the only Power and Authority of the Laws is in the Power, which can make and execute Laws. Soveraign Power is inseparable from the Person of a Soveraign Prince: and though the Exercise of it may be regulated by Laws, and that Prince does very ill, who having consented to such a Regulation, breaks the Laws; yet when he acts contrary to Law, such Acts carry Soveraign and irresistible Authority with them, while he continues a Soveraign *Prince*.

But if it be possible to convince all men how vain this pretence of Laws is to justifie Resistance or Rebellion against a *Prince*, who persecutes without or against Law, I shall only ask two plain Questions.

1. Whether the Laws of God and Nature be not as sacred and inviolable as

the

the Laws of our Country? if they be (and methinks no man ſhould dare ſay that they are not) why may we not as well reſiſt a *Prince*, who perſecutes us, againſt the Laws of God and Nature, as one, who perſecutes againſt the Laws of our Country? is not the Prince as much bound to obſerve the Laws of God and Nature, as the Laws of his Country? if ſo, then their diſtinction between ſuffering with and againſt Law ſignifies nothing. For all men, who ſuffer for well-doing, ſuffer againſt Law. For by the Laws of God, and the natural ends of humane Government, ſuch men ought to be rewarded, and not puniſht. Nay, they ſuffer contrary to thoſe Laws, which commanded them to do that good, for which they ſuffer. Thus the Chriſtians ſuffered under *Pagan Emperors*, for worſhipping one Supreme God, and refuſing to worſhip the numerous *Gods* of the *Heathens*; and therefore, according to theſe Principles, might have juſtified a Rebellion againſt thoſe unjuſt and perſecuting Powers; but the Apoſtles would not allow this to be a juſt cauſe of reſiſtance, as I have already ſhewn you; and yet I confeſs I am to ſeek for the reaſon of this difference,

rence, why we may not reſiſt a *Prince*, who perſecutes againſt the Laws of God, as well as him, who perſecutes againſt the Laws of *England*.

2. My other Queſtion is this, Whether a *Prince* have any more Authority to make wicked and perſecuting Laws, than to perſecute without Law? Theſe men tell us, that if *Paganiſm* or *Popery* were eſtabliſhed by Law, they were bound to ſuffer patiently for their Religion, without reſiſtance; but ſince *Chriſtianity* and *Proteſtancy* is the Religion of the Nation, they are not bound to ſuffer, but may defend themſelves, when they are condemned by no Law. But if we examine this throughly, it is a very weak and trifling Cavil. For what Authority has a wicked and perſecuting Law? and who gave it this Authority? what Authority has any Prince to make Laws againſt the Laws of God? if he have no Authority, then it is no Law; and then to make a wicked Law to perſecute good men, is the ſame thing, as to perſecute without Law, nay as to perſecute againſt Law. The pretence for reſiſtance is, when the Prince perſecutes without Authority. Now I ſay, a *Prince* has no more Authority to make wicked perſecuting

Julian Apoſtate.

secuting Laws, than to persecute without Law. Should a *Popish Prince* procure all our good Laws for the *Protestant Religion* to be repealed, and establish *Popery* by Law, and make it death not to be a *Papist*, he would have no more real Authority to do this, than to persecute *Protestants* without repealing the Laws. A soveraign and unaccountable Power will justifie both, so as to make resistance unlawful; but if it cannot justifie both, it can justifie neither. For a *Prince* has no more Authority to make a bad Law, than to break a good one; so that this Principle will lead them a great deal farther then they pretend to; and let the *Laws* of the *Land* be what they will, in time they may come to think it a just Reason for Rebellion, to pull down *Antichrist*, and to set up *Christ Jesus* upon this Throne. This I hope is a sufficient Answer to the two first Objections, That we are bound by no Law to suffer against Law; And that the *Prince* has no Authority against Law.

3. The next Objection is, That they have a natural right of *Self-preservation* and *Self-defence* against unjust and illegal violence. This very pretence was made great use of to wheadle People into this late

late Conſpiracy. Thoſe who were employed to prepare and diſpoſe men for *Rebellion*, askt them, whether they would not defend themſelves, if any man came to cut their throats: this they readily ſaid they would: when they had gained this point, they ask them, Whether they did not value their Liberties, as much as their Lives; and Whether they would not defend them alſo. And thus they might have proceeded to any part of their Liberties, if they had pleaſed; for they have the ſame right to any part, as to the whole, and thus Self-defence would at laſt reach to the ſmalleſt Occaſion of Diſcontent or Jealouſie, or diſlike of *Publick Government*.

Now in anſwer to this, I readily grant, that every man has a natural right to preſerve and defend his life by all lawful means; but we muſt not think every thing lawful, which we have ſtrength and power and opportunity to do; and therefore to give a full Anſwer to this Plea, let us conſider,

1. That Self-defence was never allowed by God or Nature againſt Publick Authority, but only againſt Private Violence. There was a time, when Fathers had the Power of Life and Death over their

their own Children; now I would only ask these men, Whether if a Son at that time saw his Father coming to kill him, and that as he thought very unjustly, he might kill his Father to defend himself. This never was allowed by the most barbarous Nations in the World; and yet it may be justified by this Principle of Self-defence, as it is urged by those men; which is a plain Argument that it is false. It is an express Law, that *he that smiteth his Father or his Mother shall be surely put to death*, 21 *Exod.* 15. and yet then the power of Parents was restrained by Publick Laws. And the Authority of a Prince is not less sacred than of a Parent; he's God's Minister and Vicegerent, and Subjects are expresly forbid to resist; and it is a vain thing to pretend a natural right against the express Law of God.

2. For the sole Power of the Sword is in the King's hands, and therefore no private man can take the Sword in his own defence but by the King's Authority, and certainly he cannot be presumed to give any man Authority to use the Sword against himself. And therefore as Christ tells *Peter*, *He that takes the Sword shall perish by the Sword*; he, who

who draws the Sword against the lawful Powers, deserves to dye by it.

3. We may consider also, that it is an external Law, that private defence must give place to the Publick Good. Now he that takes Arms to defend his own life and some few others, involves a whole Nation in blood and confusion, and occasions the miserable slaughter of more men, than a long succession of Tyrants could destroy. Such men sacrifice many thousand lives, both of Friends and Enemies, the happiness and prosperity of many thousand Families, the publick Peace and Tranquility of the Nation, to a private Self-defence; and if this be the Law of Nature, we may well call Nature a Step-mother, that has armed us to our own ruine and confusion.

4. And therefore we may farther observe, that Non-resistance and subjection to Government, is the best way for every mans private defence. Our Atheistical Politicians, who know no other Law of Nature, but Self-defence, make this the Original of humane Societies; That it is a voluntary Combination for Self-defence. For this Reason they set up Princes and Rulers over them, and put

the power of the Sword into their hands, that they may administer Justice, and defend their Subjects from publick and private violence: and they are certainly so far in the right, that publick Government is the best security not only of the publick peace, but of every man's private interest; nay it is so, though our Prince be a Tyrant, as I have already shewn you, that no Government can be secure without an irresistible and unaccountable Power. So that the natural right of self-defence is so far from justifying Rebellion against Princes, that it absolutely condemns it, as destructive of the best and most effectual means to preserve ourselves: for though by Non-resistance a man may expose his life to the fury of a Tyrant, so he may lose his life in any other way of defence; but publick Government is the best and surest defence, and therefore to resist publick Government, is to destroy the best means of self-defence.

5. However, this principle of self-defence, to be sure, cannot justifie a Rebellion, when men do not suffer any actual violence; and therefore those men who were drawn into this late Conspiracy, when they saw no body attempt cutting

their Throats, when they saw none of their liberties invaded, were so well prepared to be Rebels, that they needed no arguments to perswade them to it.

4. The next objection against the Doctrine of Non-resistance is this, That it destroys the difference between an absolute and limited Monarchy, between a Prince whose Will is his Law, and a Prince, who is bound to govern by Law; which undermines the Fundamental Constitution of the *English Government*. If this were true, I confess, it were a very hard case for the Ministers of the Church of *England*, who must either preach up resistance, contrary to the Laws of the Gospel, and the Sence and Practice of the Christian Church in all Ages, or must preach up Non-resistance, to the destruction of the Government under which they live; but thanks be to God, this is not true. For the difference between an absolute and limited Monarchy, is not, that resistance is unlawful in one case, and lawful in another: for a Monarch, the exercise of whose Power is limited and regulated by Laws, is as irresistible, as the most absolute Monarch, whose Will is his Law; and if he were not, I would venture to say, that the

most Absolute and Despotick Government, is more for the publick good, than a limited Monarchy.

But the difference lies in this, that an absolute Monarch is under the Government of no Law, but his own Will; he can make and repeal Laws at his pleasure, without asking the consent of any of his Subjects; he can impose what Taxes he pleases, and is not tied up to strict Rules and Formalities of Law in the execution of Justice; but it is quite contrary in a limited Monarchy, where the Exercise of Soveraign Power is regulated by known and standing Laws, which the Prince can neither make nor repeal without the consent of the People. No man can loose his Life or Estate without a legal Process and Trial; no Monies can be levied, nor any Taxes imposed on the Subject, but by Authority of Parliament; which makes the Case of Subjects differ very much from those, who live under an Arbitrary Prince.

No, you will say, the Case is just the same: for what do Laws signifie, when a Prince must not be resisted, though he break these Laws, and Govern by an Arbitrary and Lawless Will? He may make himself as Absolute, as the *Great Turk*

Turk or the *Mogul*, whenever he pleaſes; for what ſhould hinder him, when all men's hands are tied by this Doctrine of Non-reſiſtance? Now it muſt be acknowledged, that there is a poſſibility for ſuch a Prince to Govern Arbitrarily, and to trample upon all Laws; and yet the difference between an Abſolute and Limited Monarchy is vaſtly great.

1. For this Prince, though he may make his Will a Law to himſelf, and the only Rule of his Government, yet he cannot make it the Law of the Land: he may break Laws, but he can neither make nor repeal them; and therefore he can never alter the Frame and Conſtitution of the Government, though he may at preſent interrupt the regular Adminiſtration of it: and this is a great Security to Poſterity, and a preſent Reſtraint upon himſelf.

2. For it is a mighty uneaſie thing to any Prince, to Govern contrary to known Laws. He offers as great and conſtant Violence to himſelf, as he does to his Subjects. He cannot raiſe mony, nor impoſe any Taxes without the conſent of his Subjects, nor take away any man's Life without a legal Tryal (which an Abſolute Prince may do) but he is

guilty of Rapine and Murder, and feels the same rebukes in his own mind, for such illegal actions, though his impositions be but reasonable and moderate, and he put no man to death, but who very well deserves it, that an *absolute Tyrant* does for the most barbarous oppressions and cruelties. The breach of his Oath to God, and his promises and engagements to his Subjects, makes the exercise of such an arbitrary Power very troublesome: and though his Subjects are bound not to resist, yet his own guilty fears will not suffer him to be secure; and arbitrary Power is not so luscious a thing, as to tempt men to forfeit all the ease and pleasure, and security of Government for the sake of it.

3. Though Subjects must not resist such a *Prince*, who violates the Laws of his Kingdom, yet they are not bound to obey him, nor to serve him in his Usurpations. Subjects are bound to obey an *absolute Monarch*, and to serve his Will in lawful things, though they be hard and grievous; but in a *limited Monarchy*, which is governed by Laws, Subjects are bound to yield an active obedience only according to Law, though they are bound not to resist, when they suffer a-

gainſt Law. Now it is a mighty uneaſie thing to the greateſt *Tyrant*, to govern always by force; and no Prince in a limited Monarchy can make himſelf abſolute, unleſs his own Subjects aſſiſt him to do ſo.

4. And yet it is very dangerous for any Subject to ſerve his *Prince* contrary to Law. Though the *Prince* himſelf is unaccountable and irreſiſtible, yet his *Miniſters* may be called to an account, and be puniſh'd for it; and the *Prince* may think fit to look on quietly, and ſee it done: or if they eſcape at preſent, yet it may be time enough to ſuffer for it under the next *Prince*; which we ſee by experience makes all men wary how they ſerve their Prince againſt Law. None but perſons of deſperate Fortunes will do this bare-fac'd; and thoſe are not always to be met with, and as ſeldom fit to be employ'd.

5. And therefore we may obſerve, that by the Fundamental Laws of our Government, as the *Prince* muſt Govern by Law, ſo he is irreſiſtible: which ſhews, that our wiſe Law-makers did not think, that *Non-reſiſtance* was deſtructive of a *limited Monarchy*.

6. And in this long Succeſſion of

Princes in this *Kingdom*, there has been no *Prince* that has cast off the Authority of Laws, or usurpt an Absolute and Arbitrary Power: which shews how vain those Fears are, which disturb the Fancies and Imaginations of Rebels, if they be not pretended only to disturb the publick Peace.

7. *Non-resistance* is certainly the best way to prevent the change of a *limited* into an *absolute* Monarchy. The Laws of *England* have made such an admirable provision for the honour and prosperous Government of the Prince, and the Security of the Subject, that the *Kings* of *England* have as little temptation to desire to be Absolute, while their *Subjects* are Obedient and Governable, as their Subjects have, that they should be so. And if ever *our Kings* attempt to make themselves absolute (which thanks be to God, we have no prospect of yet) it will be owing to the factious and traiterous Dispositions of Subjects. When Subjects once learn the trade of Murdering Princes, and rebelling against them, it is time then for Princes to look to themselves; and if ever our Posterity should suffer under so unhappy a change of Government, they will have reason

for ever to curſe the Fanatick rage and fury of this Age; and the beſt way to remove that ſcandal, which has been already given to Princes, is by a publick profeſſion and practice of this great Goſpel-duty of Non-reſiſtance.

8. The laſt objection againſt Non-reſiſtance is this, that if reſiſtance in no caſe be allowed, the miſchiefs and inconveniences to Mankind may be intolerable. To which I ſhall briefly return theſe following anſwers.

1. That bare Poſſibilities are no argument againſt any thing. For that which may be, may not be; and there is nothing in this world, how good or uſeful or neceſſary ſoever it be in itſelf, but may poſſibly be attended with very great inconveniences; and if we muſt reject that which is good and uſeful in it ſelf, for the ſake of ſome poſſible inconveniences, which may attend it, we muſt condemn the very beſt things. Modeſty and Humility, Juſtice, and Temperance, are great and excellent Vertues; and yet we may live in ſuch an age, when theſe Vertues ſhall beggar a man, and expoſe him to contempt. Mercy and Clemency is a noble quality in a Prince, and yet it is poſſible, that the Cle-

Clemency of a Prince may ruine him, and he may spare Traitors Lives, till they take away his. Marriage is a Divine Institution, which contributes as much to the happiness and comfort of humane life, as any one thing in this world; and yet it may be you cannot name any thing neither, which many times prove so great a plague and curse to Mankind. Thus Non-resistance is a great and excellent duty, and absolutely necessary to the peace and order and good Government of the World; but yet a bad Prince may take the advantage of it, to do a great deal of mischief. And what follows from hence? that Non-resistance is no duty, because it may possibly be attended with evil consequences? then you can hardly name any thing, which is our duty; for the most excellent Vertues may at one time or other expose us to very great inconveniences; but when they do so, we must not deny them to be our duty, because we shall suffer by it; but must bear our sufferings patiently, and expect our reward from God. And yet that there is not so much danger in Non-resistance as these men would perswade the world, I hope appears from my answers to the last objection.

2. When

2. When we talk of inconveniences, we must weigh the inconveniences on both sides, and consider which are greatest. We may suffer great inconveniences by Non-resistance, when our Prince happens to prove a Tyrant; but shall we suffer fewer inconveniences were it lawful for Subjects to resist?

Which is the greatest and most merciless Tyrant? an arbitrary and lawless Prince, or a Civil War? which will destroy most mens Lives? a *Nero* or *Diocletian*, or a pitcht Battel? who will devour most Estates? a covetous and rapacious Prince, or an insolent Army, and hungry Rabble? which is the greatest oppression of the Subject? some illegal Taxes, or Plunderings, Decimations, and Sequestrations?

Who are most likely to abuse their power? the Prince, or the People? which is most probable, that a Prince should oppress his dutiful and obedient Subjects, or that some factious and designing men should misrepresent the Government of their Prince, and that the guiddy multitude should believe them? who is most likely to make a change and alteration in Government? an Hereditary Prince, or the People, who are fond of Innovations?

While

While soveraign and irresistible power is in the hands of the Prince, it is possible we may sometimes have a good one, and then we shall find no inconvenience in the Doctrine of Non-resistance. Nay, it is possible, we may have a great many good Princes, for one bad one; for Monsters are not so common, as more natural productions: so that the inconveniences we may suffer by this Doctrine will but seldom happen; but had the People Power to resist, it is almost impossible, that publick Government should ever be quiet and secure for half an age together: they are as unstable as the Seas, and as easily moved with every breath, and as outragious and tempestuous too. These are not some guesses and probabilities, but demonstrations in this unhappy age, wherein we have seen all these things acted.

The

The CONCLUSION.

Containing a ſhort Diſſuaſive from Reſiſtance and Rebellion.

HAving thus largely proved that Subjection and Non-reſiſtance is a neceſſary duty, which Subjects owe to Soveraign Princes, and anſwered all thoſe objections which are made againſt it; the reſult of all is, to perſwade Subjects to the practiſe of it. And St. *Paul* urges two very powerful arguments to perſwade us to it, *Rom.* 13.

1. That *the powers are of God, and he that reſiſteth the powers, reſiſteth the ordinance of God.* And certainly he is no Chriſtian who diſputes obedience to the Divine Ordinance and Conſtitution. A Prince is the Image, the Vice-gerent of God, and therefore Princes are called *Gods* in Scripture, and be he what he will, a good or a bad Prince, while God thinks fit to advance him to the Throne, it becomes us to ſubmit and reverence the Divine Authority. Will you

you lift up your hand against GOD? will you cast off his Authority and Government too? does not he know how to rule us? how to chuse a Prince for us? The greatest Rebel would blush to say this in so many words, and yet this is the Language of Rebellion. Men dislike their Prince, that is, that Governour, whom God sets over them: they rebel against their Prince, they Depose him, they Murder him; that is, they disown the Authority of God, they deface and destroy his Image, and offer scorn and contempt to his Vice-gerent. Earthly Princes look upon every affront and disgrace done to their Ministers and Lieutenants, to be a contempt of their own Authority; and so does God too: he who pulls down a Prince, denies God's Authority to set him up, and affronts his Wisdom in chusing him.

2. And therefore such men must not expect to escape a deserved punishment, *they shall receive to themselves damnation.* Now κρίμα may either signifie the punishment of Rebellion in this world, or in the next; and here it signifies both.

1. They shall be punisht in this world. And whoever consults Ancient and Modern

dern Histories will find, that Rebels very seldom escape punishment in this world. How often does God defeat all their Counsels, discover their secret Plots and Conspiracies! and if they be prosperous for a while, yet Vengeance overtakes them; if they escape punishment from men, they are punish'd by some such remarkable Providence, as bears the Characters of a Divine Justice in it.

2. However, such men shall not escape the punishments of the other World; and if you believe there is a Hell for Rebels and Traitors, the punishment of resistance is infinitely greater than all the mischiefs which can befal you in subjection to Princes, and a patient suffering for well doing. *What shall it profit a man, though he should gain the whole world*, which is something more than a single Crown and Kingdom, *and loose his own Soul?* Though an universal Empire were the reward of Rebellion, such a glorious Traitor, who parts with his Soul for it, would have no great reason to boast much of his purchase. Let us then reverence the Divine Judgments, let us patiently submit to our King, though he should persecute and oppress us; and expect our protection here from the

the Divine Providence, and our reward in Heaven; which is the same encouragement to Non-resistance, which we have to the practice of any other Vertue. Were the advantages and disadvantages of Resistance and Non-resistance in this World fairly estimated, it were much more eligible to submit, than to rebel against our Prince; but there can be no comparison between these two, when we take the other world into the account. The last Judgment weighs down all other considerations; and certainly Rebellion may well be said to be as the sin of Witchcraft, when it so inchants men, that they are resolved to be Rebels, though they be damned for it.

LIBRARY OF THE
UNION
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY
NEW YORK

THE END.